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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to
vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. citizen.
- are at least 18 years of age on election day.
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the
conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what
political party you consider yours, you can say “Inde-
dependent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to
vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this
election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County
Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and
address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back
cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting
place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you.
If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your vot-
ing place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth
even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in
voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the
ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t
know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll
workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls
on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and
  voting there
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’
  handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an
absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to
the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your address when you signed up to vote,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name
  underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Reg-
istrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Reg-
istrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your
absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M.
on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING
CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
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."

C 第一步
请双手持票向自动槽将整张选票插入。

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 cabezicas rojas.

D 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，竖尾之二孔，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 voto y pefiore con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

E 第三步
请把尖端之选票，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

F 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren’t enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as “D-S”; this stands for “Decline to State”.

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 5:

NONPARTISAN VOTERS: You will get an ORANGE ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the orange pages. There are four orange pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS: You will get a RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and the orange pages.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS: You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow page and the orange pages.

LIBERTARIAN VOTERS: You will be given a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue page and orange pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the orange pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
### AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

**Primary Election**

**Election Primaria 5 de Junio de 1984**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator, 3rd District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee—16th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delegates to the National Convention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegados a la Convenión Nacional</th>
<th>Candidatos</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All delegates represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presidential Preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefeencia Presidencial</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles R. Glenn</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald Willis</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon “Jack” Mohr</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. J. Lowrey</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9**

(If you are affiliated with the AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY,

begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip the next few pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>Joseph Fuhrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to the National Convention</td>
<td>Joseph Fuhrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td>Joseph Fuhrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator, 3rd District</td>
<td>Joseph Fuhrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly, 16th District</td>
<td>Joseph Fuhrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee—16th District</td>
<td>Joseph Fuhrig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9
- If you are affiliated with the LIBERTARIAN PARTY, begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip past the red pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAVRIELLE HOLMES</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS L. SERRETTE</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegates to the National Convention</th>
<th>全國大會代表。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative in Congress, 5th District</th>
<th>第五區國會眾議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE ADRIAN ‘TED’ ZUUR</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator, 3rd District</th>
<th>第三區州參議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: This page will be red)

If you are affiliated with the **PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY**, this will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMITE DEL CONDADO</th>
<th>COUNTY COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT PEARSON</td>
<td>JANE CUTTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Producer/Producer de Televisión/電視節目製作人</td>
<td>Student/Estudiante/學生</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARTHUR COVINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher/Maestro/教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>STEVE ZELTZER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizador de la Comunidad/社區組織者</td>
<td>Engineer/Ingeniero/工程師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA E. LA RIVA</td>
<td>TOM GIERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizador de la Comunidad/社區組織者</td>
<td>Janitor/Conserje/清潔工人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL GREENBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOW continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9
Continue votando en las páginas de color anaranjado, numeradas 6, 7, 8 y 9

Please vote on pages 6, 7, 8 and 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>YES 163, NO 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>YES 167, NO 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>YES 171, NO 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>YES 175, NO 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>YES 180, NO 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Resolución</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>SI 贷成</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>SI 贷成</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>SI 贷成</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>SI 贷成</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>SI 贷成</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Específica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL EN MIENNA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades benéficas de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición paritaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221
NO 222

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226
NO 227

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232
¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los previstos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

212 SI Sí
213 NO No

¿Deberá pagarles a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

216 SI Sí
217 NO No

¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

221 SI Sí
222 NO No

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Helch Helchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

226 SI Sí
227 NO No

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

231 SI Sí
232 NO No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>YES 236</td>
<td>NO 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>YES 240</td>
<td>NO 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>YES 244</td>
<td>NO 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>YES 249</td>
<td>NO 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>YES 253</td>
<td>NO 254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

¿Debe ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

Reducida de espíritu de la era posterior, después de la echarán campañas eleccionales y hacer que el sistema de votación sea más eficiente.

Arremaza que aceleramiento el alcance local lo considere en ciertas ex-
Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?  

YES 236  
NO 237

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?  

YES 240  
NO 241

Shall the Board of Supervisors be increased from six members to nine members following the November 1986 election, and shall elected members be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elective terms be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?  

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance to require the collection of costs of incarceration at a local detention facility from a defendant who the Court finds financially able to pay?  

Shall an ordinance be adopted providing for certain structures which will be utilized by the Recreation and Park Department?  

President  
1 or 8.**  
16. 153  154  
17. 157  168  
18. 171  172  
U.S. Congress Representative  
1.  
19. 175  176  
20. 180  181  
State Senator (if applicable)  
1.  
21. 185  186  
22. 190  191  
State Assembly  
1.  
23. 196  197  
24. 204  205  
County Committee*  
1.  
25. 207  208  
26. 209  210  
27. 211  212  
28. 213  214  
29. 215  216  
30. 217  218  
31. 219  220  
32. 221  222  
33. 223  224  
34. 225  226  
35. 227  228  
36. 229  230  
37. 231  232  
38. 233  234  
39. 235  236  
40. 237  238  
CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS  
A. 240  241  
B. 242  243  
C. 244  245  
D. 246  247  
E. 248  249  
F. 250  251  
G. 252  253  
H. 254  255  
I. 256  257  
J. 258  259  
K. 260  261  
(*) Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.

Muni Court Judge  
1.  

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G. ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H. ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I. ¿Debería la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1996, y deberán cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J. ¿Debería San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro de los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado y otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K. ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won't be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don't vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212

NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!
Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it. It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Caiden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sadonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Corbato
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Lilyy Denchelm
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopf
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education

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

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits.

Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren DeMerritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits.

Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, San Francisco Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Democratic Club
David Loeman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arthur Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, San Francisco Labor Union Party
Jim Wernab
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carolyn Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it's good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition a will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it's fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane Mckaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.
San Francisco's police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.
San Francisco can't afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION "A". A YES vote on PROPOSITION "A" will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don't skimp on San Francisco's future.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City's business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitacion Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Pachew
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philippson
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udove
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn't allow it.
Imagine if you had to pay for your family's health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it's like to have a job that doesn't cover these costly services.
Proposition A would give public employees the right to bar-

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church

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

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?
Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.
All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.
A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.
San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.
Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.
Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy J. Jaynes
Grandval A. Jackson
Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes
Mattie Scott
Martha Simmons
Forrest Prickett
Gloria Johnston
Matilda Whetstone
Mildred Sorells
Ben Johnson
Bessie Stoneham
Jance Reynolds
Constance Rodgers
Tommie Steele Jr.
Rhonda Darren
Robert B. Johnson Jr.
Gregory E. Fields
Gwendolyn Tibadeaux
Juanita Francis
Albert R. Carter
Annie Y. Bradford
Anthony Wagner
Beatrice Brown
Elsie Mobley
Carrol Smith
Lenora Meacham
Madison J. Bland
Reverend Johnnie Robinson
Arthur Kelly
Mary Ellen W. Garr
Audrey V. Jacques
Rufia Conn
Dorothy V. Kelsey
Anna Doll Taylor
William Bailey
Gloria Duke
Lynne Haynes
Arthur W. Rose
Dorothy Elliott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.
It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.
Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Marla O'Brien
Virginia Lozada
Cornelia Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg
Sally Raf
Amor Cruz
John Garb
Bryna Ballin
Lily Tseu
Eva Tan
Germaine Uribe
Pat Hoover
Lloyd C. Jackson
Nova Bevel
Brenda Barros

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.
Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outdated, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.
A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaicks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus
Marie Jobling
Test Rouvert
Ron Huberman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Bryer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Suam Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don't let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don't let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecific and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to reverse the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won't have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor's statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can't stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A! Let's not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216

NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Horgisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 2/3% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.). The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the "high crime" evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city's Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

"Night Differential" is as basic as "apple pie."
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
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Police Night Pay

that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco.
Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silverstri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John Moy
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate

Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committeeman
Stanley Brunwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Dennis Mark
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committeeman
Lisa Kloiber
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committeeman

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeewoman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry “goes with the territory”! It is one of the reasons why a regular “entry rank” Q2 Patrolman’s annual “pay package” is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PREPRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.
Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:

2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35

33
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry … and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President.
Robert Guichard, Vice President.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition “C” will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition “C” simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

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

8.465 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be au-
thorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds
for reconstruction and replacement of existing
facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need
voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project
is the City’s water transport and power generating
facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to
sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or
develop water and electric power facilities it must
submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are
repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the
voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the
approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the
Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue
bonds for reconstruction and replacement of exist-
ing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues
would require voter approval. Proposition E would
also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off
the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy
Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the
Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of
3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell reve-
 nue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All
other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter
approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all
Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the
voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the ques-
tion of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Willie Ken-
nedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy
Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, and Nancy
Walker.

None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the fol-
lowing statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:
“Should the proposed Charter amendment be
adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself,
affect the cost of government. However, as a result of
its possible future application, revenue bonds could be
issued in specified circumstances to finance certain
Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these pos-
sible future actions on the cost of government can not
be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facili-

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F"

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!
San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section

6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities: (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of

(Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236

NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place.

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240 ♦

NO 241 ♦

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer. This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go un supervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committeee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John Moy
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Elec President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinosa for Congress,

and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President. Board of Supervisors

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It's time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Cacciato, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Macone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261
Paul Voracelli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400
Lutnie Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello  
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*  
Stafford Buckley  
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*  
Marie Clesby  
Eric Craven  
Gwenn Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs*  
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*  
Douglas Ensign, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*  
Jim Fay, San Francisco Tenants Union*  
Jim Foster  
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*  
Jeff Greendorfer  
Roma Guy, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*  
John Holtclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*  
Agar Jaicka  
David and Edith Jenkins  
Marie Jobling  
Rodney Johnson  
Joseph Kelliker, S.F. Tenants Union*  
Tony Kline, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*  
Margal Kaufman  
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*  
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*  
Toby Levine  
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*  
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*  
Sun Palomares-Criollo  
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*  
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*  
Linda Pax, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*  
George M. Raya  
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*  
Sal Rovetti, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*  
Texas Rowerol  
Tom Saunders  
Stan Shields  
Marion Sills  
Arthur Simon  
Peter Stern  
Doris Thomas, Adj. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*  
Mary Vahl  
Dana Van Gorder  
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*  
Esther “B” Woest, CLU*  
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*  
Maura Kealey  
Dennis A. Antenore  
Betty Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*  
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*  
Robert R. Bucci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*  
Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*  
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*  
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*  
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*  
Madeline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*  
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*  
A. Christine Wilkes, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*  
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*  
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*  
*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein  
William Coblentz  
Jerome Adams  
Tosly Tosta  
Louis Giraudo  
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people possible people to office, not by reducing the number of mem-

Terry Pimsleur, Terry Pimsleur and Company
Aileen C. Hernandez, Aileen C. Hernandez Associates
Fred Ateyeh, President, Independent Grocers Association*
Walter G. Jebe, Jebe’s Kompakt Kameras
Dana Walsh, President, Greater Clement Street Merchants Association*

*Organization listed for identification purposes only.

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

 Para una balota de votante ausente, por favor complete este formulario.

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA-
SIGNATURE-FIRMA-
RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCIÓN-

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Por favor complete la información de abajo.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

Solicitud de balota por correo permanente.

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE

Solicitud de balota por correo permanente.

DATE-FECHA-

FOR REGISTRAR’S USE ONLY

State the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Estado la siguiente razón para solicitar balota por correo permanente:

Date Deput Registrar
WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardi, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cletsy
Eric Creven
Gwenn Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foi
Charlie
Jeff Grie
Roma G
John H
Agar J
David L
Marie J
Rudney
Joseph
Tony K
Margaret
Steven
Joseph

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

As business leaders of our community, we are concerned about the impact of this measure on our city and your life.

City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

* grow
* provide jobs
* raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Palomares-Criollas
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Rey
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Roux
Tom Saunders

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.
The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods’ small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hom
Richard Cerbator, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yuri Wade, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Obrero
Al Borvice, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hartado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zaretti L. Gouby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sodonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I. The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face**; deletions are indicated by *strikethrough type*.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn't have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it's working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let's put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they're able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn't result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can't afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco's Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gilham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERE TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.

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

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253

NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks is shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Robert Crummer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Ditra
Rebecca Evans
Amy Meyer
Keith Eckman
Tommy Harris
Frances McAteer
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Yruegas
Tom Mulloy, General Manager

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Willinda McCrea
William Kubins
Margaret Bremen
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Buckley
Ella Cahn
Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lew
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rafal

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hunicutt
Carol Negro
Arden Danekas
Heide Chipp
Tom Lylequist
Dick Greubell
John Holzchaw

Dan Sweeney
Jack Trujillo
Jane Windrow
Lottie Lawson

Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hunicutt
Carol Negro
Arden Danekas
Heide Chipp
Tom Lylequist
Dick Greubell
John Holzchaw

Carl Pope
Mirtane Blumenthal
Joyce Hall
Don Horanzy
Robert Maehlhuber
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Roberta Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical “common sense” politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Bob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bystiek
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants’ Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feuer
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on “K”.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women’s Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Park Shadow Ban

lems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, each member, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.
(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of this charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.
(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may award any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census.

For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensation and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census.

For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensation are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensation and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of fireman classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strikers, fillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may award any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same.

Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference to amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds herefore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, as of June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board’s pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief ad-
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the office of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefore to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 6th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said office on said 6th day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1983 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 6th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 6th day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
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CRÉDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Roberta Bor- ganova, Stephanie Salter and Susan Kwock. They were assisted by Thomas Toomey of the City Attorney’s Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
  • are a U.S. citizen.
  • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
  • are a resident of California, and
  • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
  • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  • your address when you signed up to vote,
  • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
  • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

STEP 1

If you make a mistake, return your card and get another.

Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuélva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

STEP 2

Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

Pase 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

STEP 3

Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfora con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuélva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuélva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuélva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuélva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren't enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as "D-S"; this stands for "Decline to State".

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 5:

**NONPARTISAN VOTERS:** You will get an ORANGE ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the orange pages. There are four orange pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

**PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS:** You will get a RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and the orange pages.

**AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS:** You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow page and the orange pages.

**LIBERTARIAN VOTERS:** You will be given a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue page and orange pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the orange pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferencia Presidencial</td>
<td>投選統領</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CHARLES R. GLENN | 29 |
| GERALD WILLIS | 31 |
| GORDON “JACK” MOHR | 33 |
| A. J. LOWREY | 35 |

Delegates to the National Convention
Delegados a la Convención Nacional

NO DELEGATION HAS FILED

Representative in Congress, 5th District
Diputado al Congreso, Distrito 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NO CANDIDATE FILED

State Senator, 3rd District
Senador Estatal, Distrito 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITED STATES SENATOR</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NO CANDIDATE FILED

Member of the Assembly
Miembro de la Asamblea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITED STATES ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NO CANDIDATE FILED

Member, County Central Committee—16th District
Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito #16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITED STATES COUNTY COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 8</th>
<th>請選8名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NO CANDIDATE FILED

---

NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE YELLOW

If you are affiliated with the AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY,

begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip the next few pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Information</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferencia Presidencial</td>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor de Economia</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate to the National Convention</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegados a la Convención Nacional</td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>Representative to Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputado al Congreso, Distrito 5</td>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td>Representative to Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor de Economia</td>
<td>Representative to Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly, 16th District</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>Member of Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>Member of Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee—16th District</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>Member of County Central Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito #16</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>Member of County Central Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9
Contíne votando en las páginas de color anaranjado, numeradas 6, 7, 8 y 9

(Note: This page will be blue)
If you are affiliated with the LIBERTARIAN PARTY,

begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip past the red pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
**PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY**

### President Preference
- **TOM CONDIT**
- **SONIA JOHNSON**
- **GAVRIELLE HOLMES**
- **DENNIS L. SERRETTE**

### Delegates to the National Convention
- **NO DELEGATION HAS FILED**

### Representative in Congress, 5th District
- **HENRY CLARK**
- **THEODORE ADRIAN ‘TED’ ZUUR**

---

There is no contest for State Senator in this District.

Now continue voting on the next page / Continúe votando en la siguiente página

---

*(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE RED)*

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

this will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of the Assembly, 16th District</th>
<th>NO CANDIDATE FILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td>第十六區州議員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, County Central Committee—16th District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito # 16</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preston Wood</th>
<th>Type Setter/Tipógrafo/排字工人</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Bender</td>
<td>Factory Worker/Empleada de Fábrica/ 工業工人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard E. Becker</td>
<td>Political Activist/Activista Político/ 政治組織者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayren Huidburgh</td>
<td>Storeowner/Propietaria de Tienda/ 店主</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Heater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Johhnie Stevens</th>
<th>Political Activist/Activista Político/ 政治活動家</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shiane Summer</td>
<td>Gay Community Activist/Activista de la Comunidad Homosexual/ 與性戀活動份子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Seeman</td>
<td>Artist/Artista/ 藝術家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Ellen Phillips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jane Cutrer</th>
<th>Student/Estudiante/ 學生</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Covington</td>
<td>Teacher/Maestro/ 課員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Clark</td>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizador de la Comunidad/ 社區組織者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria E. La Riva</td>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizador de la Comunidad/ 社區組織者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Zeltzer</td>
<td>Engineer/Ingeniero/ 工程師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Giering</td>
<td>Janitor/Conserje/ 清潔工人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Greenberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9
Continúe votando en las páginas de color anaranjado, numeradas 6, 7, 8 y 9

(Note: This page will be RED)

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
## JUDICIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

**JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL**

Oficina Número Uno  第一庭

Vote por Uno  限選一人

---

| 158 | ALBERT, C. WOLLENBERG, JR |
|     | Juez de la Corte Municipal |
|     | 地方法院法官 |

| 160 | JONATHAN McCURDY |
|     | Abogado Defensor de Inquilinos |
|     | 住客律师 |

---

### DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

| 163 | SI  | 贇成 |
| 164 | NO  | 反对 |

| 167 | SI  | 贇成 |
| 168 | NO  | 反对 |

| 171 | SI  | 贇成 |
| 172 | NO  | 反对 |

| 175 | SI  | 贇成 |
| 176 | NO  | 反对 |

| 180 | SI  | 贇成 |
| 181 | NO  | 反对 |

---

**ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CÁRCERES DE CONDADO DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárcel de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correcionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.

**ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la específica adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.

**ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.

**FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS.** Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrán incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere otra elección para llenar la vacante.

---

**一九八四年選舉額外建房公債法案，這個法案規定發行公債 $250,000,000，用作興建，重建，改建和更新房產，以及見及維持等費用。**

**一九八四年建築額外建房公債法案，這個提案規定發行公債 $300,000,000，用作興建、重建、裝修，以及維持維持等費用。**

**一九八四年加州公園及康樂設施法案，這個法案規定發行公債 $370,000,000，以便進行指定的購買、發展、恢復及修復實業，以作公園、海灘、康樂或歷史保存等用途。**

**一九八四年魚類與野生生物生長地帶改進法案。這個法案規定發行公債 $85,000,000，用作贊助區內野生動物保護區及州際魚類保護區，作指定的購買新、改進及發展生長地帶之用。**

**民選官員，凡發表詆譭性或造謠性競選言論，因而導致競選者負者，其實格予以取消。財政影響，無直接財政影響。如一職位的候選人被取消資格，地方政府則必須進行一次選舉以補充空缺，則可能負債額外選舉開支。**
PUBLICATION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los límites de la caja de jubilación público como fondos fiduciarios. Específica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están en una tasa más alta a más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director de la Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del recaudo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúos. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades. Impacto adicional: gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
## NONPARTISAN BALLOT

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgar a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberá pagarse a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 p.m. y las 7:00 a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

F. ¿Deberán otorgar a los empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Valores, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la ser posteriores a la elecciones?

¿Denanza que arcelamiento local lo conside?

¿Se prohibe los es estructuras a sobre prbación y Paramente autorité Municipal in ciertas ex-

¿Debe permitir la Revolución el dere de los ciudadanos a participar en el proceso electoral y democrático?
NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

G  Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?  YES 236 NO 237

H  Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?  YES 240 NO 241

I  Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members following the November 1986 election, and be further reduced to seven members on a November 1986 election, and shall elections be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered?  YES 244

J  Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance allowing the collection of costs of incarceration of defendant from a defendant found financially able to pay?  

K  Shall an ordinance be adopted providing for certain structures which will cause the Recreation and Park Department to use the approval of the City Planning Commission for ordinance, with certain exceptions?  

VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>YES 216 NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presential candidate)</td>
<td>16 215 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td>19 216 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td>21 217 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td>22 218 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Committee*</td>
<td>23 219 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)</td>
<td>24 220 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Court Judge</td>
<td>25 221 220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
236 SI 贊成
237 NO 反對

¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

退休制度條款－總經理及投資主任應否由退休委員會委任並免於退休制度？

240 SI 贊成
241 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

應否取消合併檔案官和選民註冊官職務的權力，檔案官改為首府行政官管理下的另一官職？

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

應否將一九八四年十一月選舉後的市議員人數由十一人減為九人，而將一九八六年十一月選舉後人數再減為七人；應否將市參議會選舉的年份由偶數年改為奇數年份？

249 SI 贊成
250 NO 反對

¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

當金山應否通過法令，規定縣監獄或其他地方的監獄須向法院認定負有付能力的被告人收取監禁費？

253 SI 贊成
254 NO 反對

¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?

應否通過法令，禁止發出批准給某些建築物，而此等建築物將在康樂及公園管理局的物業上投射巨大陰影，除非預先獲得市規劃委員會按此法令作出某些例外的特准？
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN MCCURDY
My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.
My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?

1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco. Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

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

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it. It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION "A" will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn't give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco's labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city's best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco's basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let's keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

PROPOSITION "A" will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION "A" would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION "A" would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION "A" would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION "A" gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.

VOTE for PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sadonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cervantes
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Danebrim
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education

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

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bieman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Johnnie Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Mieden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitation Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Fuchow
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philosonian
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udovich
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bar-

gain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Granddel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Hayes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blu
Martha Ryan
Maria O’Brien

Virginia Lozano
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service re-form into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outdated, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaques
Pat Jackson
Bill Krause

Marie Jabling
Tess Rousser
Ron Huberman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.
San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Steed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote "NO" on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A would “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won't have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors' ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor's statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can't stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let's not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

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

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 1/4% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city's Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

"Night Differential" is as basic as "apple pie."
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
Police Night Pay

that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government. Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John Moy
Republican Central Committee

Marc Woods
Republican State Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate

Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committeeman

Stanley Brunweli
Republican Central Committeeman

Republicans for Night Pay:

San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committeeman

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeewoman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry “goes with the territory”! It is one of the reasons why a regular “entry rank” Q2 Patrolman’s annual “pay package” is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.
Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221
NO 222

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2 1/2% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7 1/2% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINNS ON PAGE 35
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent "on-the-front-line" fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay "on-the-front-line", and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition "C", a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nico

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre "TIME SERVED" proposal would raise each fireman's pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual "pay package" for a regular "entry rank" H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial automatic pay increases again in July!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent "RAPID TURNOVER" problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter's Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition "C".

If passed, this "longevity of service" premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "C".

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.

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

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco's firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the "problem" alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco. Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification; (2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class; (3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and (4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
Hetch Hetchy Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!
San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to ap-
prove or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Water Department Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)

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

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet. Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to replace the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place.

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES  240
NO   241

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:
“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republicam County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition "I".

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committeee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.


Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Francisco needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

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

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
C. Al Cusick, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Vinaculis, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Camning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleatby
Eric Craven
Gwenn Craig, Co-chair, National Asan, of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of New Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Fayre, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendyke
Romey Gay, Co-Director, Women's Foundation*
John Hofsckow, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jaicks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kelleher, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margal Kaufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Ommerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Pailmores-Curlois
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Brenda Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Poo, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Reyes
Joel Rosa, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Su Roselli, President, Alice B. Tolkis Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rowerd
Tom Saunders
Stan Smith
Matrin Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "B" Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maurie Kealby
Dennis A. Antinore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women's Forum*
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "I".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Ruey, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
Lt. Lester O'Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. White, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Madeline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne J. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloys, Member, Republican County Central Committee*
*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential in the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City's finances are sound. Our economy continues to:
  - grow
  - provide jobs
  - raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city's best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernasia
William Ceballos
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraud
Henry Berman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Horne
Richard Ceballos, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yvonne Wadle, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tong, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jos Estes

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlos Tellez, President of the Board of Directors
Clemente Obregon
Al Bovis, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Horacio

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City Fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Darin Ward
Supervisor Willie Brown
Dr. Zurell, Gossby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sonoma Williams, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I. The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county. At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of Janurary, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
Jail Cost Reimbursement

PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with

the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47 00 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re

able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Brit, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can't be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It's only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they're convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
**PROPOSITION K**

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “K”**

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

"Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time."

---

**How “K” Got on Ballot**

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

---

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Duira
Rebecca Evans
Toby Brauchtan, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical “common sense” politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Halie
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center

Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel

Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition

John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Benoifce Church

Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association

leroey Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West

Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition

Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times

Barbara Bytel
Executive Director
Hospitality House

Richard Parker
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth

Sue Hestor

Brad Paul

Ruth Gravanis

David Jones

Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

ARGUMENTS PRINTED ON THIS PAGE ARE THE OPINION OF THE AUTHORS AND HAVE NOT BEEN CHECKED FOR ACCURACY BY ANY OFFICIAL AGENCY.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

VOTE NO ON "K"

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in city parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor

Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.
(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.
(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon. The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”. Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date
of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protec-
tive officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman
protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compen-
sation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective
date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police
patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this char-
ter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for
the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation
as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may re-
ward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct.
The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commis-
sion, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is
a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant there-
after, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of
sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service
commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, addi-
tional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle
traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000
population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decen-
tal census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and
certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty
shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to
two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of
the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic
duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average addi-
tional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in
the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to
two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this para-
graph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the
civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certifica-
tion. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations
and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation pro-
vided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per
month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service
commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of
compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments
of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based
upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil ser-
cvice commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said
certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fire-
man classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as
firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be
its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of
the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or other-
wise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in
lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day
of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance:

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensa-
tion shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensa-
tion paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included
in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as
used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages cer-
tified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen
classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be estab-
lished in accordance with the general percentage differential between
seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified
by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall in-
clude the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordi-
nance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount
which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section,
halves being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in rela-
tion to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of
wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working
benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vaca-
tions, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night
or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or
rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever.
The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section
that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range
scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be
allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only
as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of com-
penstation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean
“salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of
1952, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons em-
ployed by the fire department of said cities of 350,000 population or
over of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially
the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers,
stormers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire
department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include
members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on mili-
itary leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be
reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose
of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided
in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission
may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or
meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretion-
ary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in
any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire pre-
vention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and
public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thir-
ten percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain
and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation
for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety,
and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above
the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided
for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar
amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage
adjustment specified in this subsection, halves being taken to the next
higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of sub-
section (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant
to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same.
Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed
pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above,
whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided,
further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of
sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensa-
tion attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have
the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the
charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to
amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordi-
nance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of com-
penstation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for
uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then cur-
rent fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service
commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission at its request by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (c).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.
(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.
(c) Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing Hetch Hetchy water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under the commission's jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds (a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuing of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Audit

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at its the board’s pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties

The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief ad-
those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1981 who were elected to said offices on said 8th day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permits governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48
Applicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
Primary Election
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CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Roberta Borganova, Stephanie Salter and Susan Kwock. They were assisted by Thomas Toomey of the City Attorney’s Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
  ● are a U.S. citizen.
  ● are at least 18 years of age on election day.
  ● are a resident of California, and
  ● are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  ● Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
  ● mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  ● your address when you signed up to vote,
  ● the address where you want the ballot mailed,
  ● then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

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

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 cabechas rojas.

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

STEP 4

After voting, follow the instructions on the Votomatic and place the ballot card inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Fourth step: After voting, follow the instructions on the Votomatic and place the ballot card inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren't enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as “D-S”; this stands for “Decline to State”.

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 5:

**NONPARTISAN VOTERS:** You will get an ORANGE ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the orange pages. There are four orange pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

**PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS:** You will get a RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and the orange pages.

**AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS:** You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow page and the orange pages.

**LIBERTARIAN VOTERS:** You will be given a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue page and orange pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the orange pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
### AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>GERALD WILLIS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferencia Presidencial</td>
<td>GORDON “JACK” MOHR</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. J. LOWREY</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES R. GLENN</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delegates to the National Convention
Delegados a la Convención Nacional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS Filed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representative in Congress
Diputado al Congreso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Senator, 3rd District
Senador Estatal, Distrito 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member of the Assembly
Miembro de la Asamblea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member, County Central Committee—17th District
Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito #17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9

(Note: This page will be yellow)

If you are affiliated with the AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY,

begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip the next few pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSTAL OFFICE BOX 488</th>
<th>JUNE 5, 1984</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>Preferencia Presidencial</td>
<td>選擇總統</td>
<td>拉普瑞德</td>
<td>投選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to the National Convention</td>
<td>Delegados a la Convención Nacional</td>
<td>全國大會代表</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 6th District</td>
<td>Diputado al Congreso, Distrito 6</td>
<td>第六區國會議員</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD CREIGHTON</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>HOWARD CREIGHTON</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>HOWARD CREIGHTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Finance Specialist</td>
<td>Especialista en Financiacion para Viviendas</td>
<td>房屋貸款專家</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator, 3rd District</td>
<td>Senador Estatal, Distrito 3</td>
<td>第三區州參議員</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td>Propietario de Pequenos Negocios</td>
<td>小商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly, 17th District</td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td>第十七區州議員</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee—17th District</td>
<td>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito #17</td>
<td>自由黨縣郡中央委員會委員，第十七區郡</td>
<td>請選11名</td>
<td>請選11名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td>Propietario de Pequenos Negocios</td>
<td>小商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9. Continué votando en las páginas de color anaranjado, numeradas 6, 7, 8 y 9.
### PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY

**Presidential Preference**  
*Preferencia Presidencial*  
*투표 통산*

**Vote for One**  
*Vota por Uno*  
*請選一名*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAVRIELLE HOLMES</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS L. SERRETTE</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delegates to the National Convention**  
*Delegados a la Convenión Nacional*  
*全體大會代表*

**Vote for One**  
*Vota por Uno*  
*請選一名*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representative in Congress, 6th District**  
*Diputado al Congreso, Distrito 6*  
*第六區國會議員*

**Vote for One**  
*Vota por Uno*  
*請選一名*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE HAS QUALIFIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Senator, 3rd District**  
*Senador Estatal, Distrito 3*  
*第三區州參議員*

**Vote for One**  
*Vota por Uno*  
*請選一名*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Socialist Organizer*  
*Organizador Socialista*  
*社會主義組織者*

---

**Continue voting on the next page / Continúe votando en la siguiente página**

*請在下頁繼續投票.*

---

*(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE RED)*

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

this will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
### Peace & Freedom Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of the Assembly, 17th District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>當選一名</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>香港自由黨</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>和平自由黨</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>二零一九年六月五日</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, County Central Committee—17th District</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito # 17</td>
<td>請投票 15 名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>縣區中央委員會委員，第十七議區</td>
<td>香港自由黨</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>香港自由黨</td>
<td>和平自由黨</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAY WOODY</td>
<td>Typesetter/Tipógrafo/ 排字工人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL R. MENEELY</td>
<td>Unemployed Truck Driver/Camionero Desempleado/ 失業貨車司機</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FIGUEIREDO</td>
<td>Warehouseman/Bodeguero/ 貨倉工人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIANNE DITTON</td>
<td>Lesbian Activist/Activista Lesbian/ 女同性戀活動分子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAYLE M. JUSTICE</td>
<td>Director Senior Programs/Director de Programas para Ancianos/ 老人計劃主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILLIP BRUCE JOSSELYN</td>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizador de la Comunidad/ 社區組織者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA JACKSON</td>
<td>Lesbian/Gay Activist/Activista de Lesbianas/Homosexuales/ 女、男同性戀活動分子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>Socialist Organizer/Organizador Socialista/ 社會主義組織者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHANIE J. HEDGE COKE</td>
<td>Union Printer/ Impresor Sindicalista/ 工會會員印刷工人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONI ARENSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEN EVANS</td>
<td>Writer/Escritor/ 作家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN LATHAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE C. LA RIVA</td>
<td>Childcare Worker/Trabajadora en Cuidado de Niños/ 托兒工作者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE ADRIAN “TED” ZUUR</td>
<td>Waiter/Mezcalero/ 侍者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9

Continúe votando en las páginas de color anaranjado, numeradas 6, 7, 8 y 9

(Nota: Esta página será roja)

If you are affiliated with the Peace & Freedom Party,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
NONPARTISAN BALLOT

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

Office Number One  Vote for One

ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR  158
Judge of Municipal Court

JONATHAN McCURDY  160
Tenant Attorney

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

16  COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.

YES 163
NO 164

17  NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.

YES 167
NO 168

18  CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.

YES 171
NO 172

19  FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.

YES 175
NO 176

20  ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.

YES 180
NO 181
### BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

**JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Acta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Comentarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>ALBERT, C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>Juez de la Corte Municipal</td>
<td>1984 ano reforma de ley para el financiamiento de juzgados municipales. Esta ley permite el establecimiento de fondos para la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación y renovación de las instalaciones de los juzgados municipales.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Acta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Comentarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


### FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfa en las elecciones, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante. | 1984 ano del Código de Procesos Civiles. Esta ley proporciona un marco legal para la defensa de inquilinos. |
NONPARTISAN BALLOT

PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICAS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están en tasas más altas o más bajas debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL. MENIDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. MENIDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para proteger contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades bienales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición parlamentaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

BOLATA INDEPENDIENTE 無政黨選票
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?  

**A**  
YES 212  
NO 213  

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?  

**B**  
YES 216  
NO 217  

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?  

**C**  
YES 221  
NO 222  

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?  

**E**  
YES 226  
NO 227  

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?  

**F**  
YES 231  
NO 232
A ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarle a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B ¿Deberá pagársela a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactoriamente recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO  

236 SI 贷成  
237 NO 反对  

¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones estar exento del Servicio Civil?

240 SI 贷成  
241 NO 反对  

¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

— JUNE 5, 1984

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M. Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)

r reducida de espues de la era posterior-después de la leberan cam- as elecciones
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Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

**G**

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

**H**

Shall the Board of Supervisors be increased to nine members following the November 1986 election, and shall be further reduced to seven members at the next General Election?

**I**

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance to regulate the collection of costs of incarceration of persons committed to a local detention facility from a defendant who finds financially able to pay?

**J**

Shall an ordinance be adopted providing for certain structures which will carry out the Recreation and Park Department's vision: to develop the approval of the City Planning Commission, with certain exceptions?

**K**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTER SELECTION CARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CANDIDATES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| President
| 1 or 8.**
| ("Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presentational candidate)
| 1. 163 164
| 2. 167 168
| 3. 171 172
| 4. 175 176
| 5. 180 181
| 6. 185 186
| 7. 190 191
| 8. 196 197
| 9. 204 205
| 10. 209 210
| State Senator (if applicable)
| 1. 212 213
| 2. 216 217
| 3. 221 222
| 4. 226 227
| 5. 231 232
| 6. 236 237
| 7. 240 241
| 8. 244 245
| 9. 249 250
| 10. 253 254

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G  ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H  ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I  ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J  ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro de los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K  ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services - services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services - services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sedonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Deneich
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierno
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Audo
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hade Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Moraler
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Mixon
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in. San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitacion Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Pacheco
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Phlebas
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udovich
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O’Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornellia Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jacks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tess Rouvelas
Ron Huberman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black  Buck Bagot
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond  Diana Jaicks
Charles Breyer, Attorney  Henry Del
Regina Need  Susan E. Walters
Lydia San Felippo  Elisabeth Jewel
John J. Simpson, Retired  Betty Brooks
Susan Kelly Kennedy  Paula Pede

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition "A".

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to "collectively bargain" for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition "A" would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition "A".

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote "NO" on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say "yes" or "no" to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of govern-

ment, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will "open up the world" on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don't let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don't let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote "NO" on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won't have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let's not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 1/4% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department

police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.)

The only police officers not receiving night differential are the

San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers

can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city's Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been

employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaske Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.”

Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport

police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
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that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.
I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest “Chuck” Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Cacciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silva
Republican Central Committeeman
State Senate Candidate

Max Wood
Republican State Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Fultsner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John May
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate

Leo Paree
Republican Central Committeeman

Stanley Braunfeld
Republican Central Committeeman

Deane Mark
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committeeman

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeewoman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry “goes with the territory”. It is one of the reasons why a regular “entry rank” Q2 Patrolman’s annual “pay package” is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE:
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Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Giachard, VICE PRESIDENT.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don't clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco's firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem" alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance:
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "E" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "E" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City's General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy's facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "E" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be paid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F"

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!
San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Water Department Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priorities: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of

(Continued on page 62)

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 Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application
is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.
Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kapp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!
For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place

Civil Service.
Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES  244
NO  245

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller's Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition "I".

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the "BIG PIE" at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote "YES".

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Chairman
State Assembly Candidate
George Rehmert
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee Chairman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Chairman
State Assembly Candidate
Robert Guichard
Businessman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee Chairman
Former City Commissioner
John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committee Chairman
Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate
Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on "I" (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).


Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Francisco against San Francisco. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of the City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposal will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
C. Al. Cavaiato, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moacine
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Varanelli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Maher
Sue Berman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardin, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Cunningham, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleasby
Eric Craven
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendrifter
Ronny Gay, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holzclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jacks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kellihier, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kiley, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margot Koffman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Patoneres-Criolos
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Raya
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rouverol
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Silks
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thoms, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "B" Wente, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Betse Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representaive of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "I".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert B. Bacci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-Presdient, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Marilyn A. Caxx, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yue, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*

Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Blayer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coldren
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Girardino
Henry Herman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Terry Pimsleur, Terry Pimsleur and Company
Aileen C. Hernandez, Aileen C. Hernandez Associates
Fred Ateyeh, President, Independent Grocers Association*
Walter G. Jebe, Jebe's Kompact Kameras
Dana Walsh, President, Greater Clement Street Merchants Association*

*Organization listed for identification purposes only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zaretti L. Goody, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brook, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sodonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I. The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by struckout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of Supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed...
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES  249
NO   250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Muher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can't be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It's only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they're convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253

NO 254

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn.

To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism, Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Moltuari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Engeur L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert DuPra
Rebecca Evans
Amy Meyer
Keith Eckman
Tommy Harris
Frances McKeeer
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Yrgas
Tom Malloy, General Manager

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Engeur L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hunnicutt
Carol Negro
Arden Dinekas
Heide Chipp
Tim Liflyquist
Dick Grossbach
John Holtzclaw

Carl Pape
Miriam Blaustein
Joyce Hall
Don Horanac
Robert Mackahaner
Stuley J. Herzstein
Aune Halsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Leeper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bystek
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants’ Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Hopeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feeler
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on “K”.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women’s Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes on our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
lens occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week provided herein, but when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to paid service, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation curable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification, the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department. Such annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of fireman classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for fire members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stroke, fillmen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(b) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.

Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407(e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54300 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.497 (c).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that

the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

3.670 Board Composition
The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary
The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.
The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief administrative officer, to prescribe general rules and regulations for the administrative service under his control; to have a voice but no vote in the board of supervisors, with the right to report on or to discuss any matter before the said board concerning the affairs of the departments in his charge; to make such recommendations and propose such measures to the mayor, the board of supervisors, or committees thereof, concerning the affairs of the city and county in his charge as he may deem necessary; to coordinate the functioning of the several departments of the city and county charged with powers and duties relating to control of traffic; and to provide for the budgeting and control of publicity and advertising expenditures of the city and county.
The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the office of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefore to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint his executive assistant who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1989, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons, who are members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1989 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January 1989. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982, there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected; and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁
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PROPOSITION D

Proposition D was withdrawn by the Board of Supervisors on March 12.

PROPOSITION E

Would allow certain types of Hetch Hetchy bonds to be issued without going on the ballot.

Analysis ............... 36
Arguments .............. 37
Legal Text .............. 37, 61

PROPOSITION F

Would allow certain types of Water Department bonds to be issued without going on the ballot.

Analysis ............... 38
Arguments .............. 39
Legal Text .............. 39, 62

PROPOSITION G

Would allow the appointment of 2 Retirement System managers, exempt from the Civil Service process.

Analysis ............... 40
Arguments .............. 41
Legal Text .............. 62

PROPOSITION H

Would establish the Recorder as an independent agency, under the CAO.

Analysis ............... 42
Arguments .............. 43
Legal Text .............. 62, 63

PROPOSITION I

Would reduce the number of Supervisors from 11 to 7 and would change supervisorial elections to odd-numbered years.

Analysis ............... 44
Arguments .............. 45-50
Legal Text .............. 50, 63

PROPOSITION J

Would allow the City to charge prisoners for the cost of jail, if they can afford to pay.

Analysis ............... 51
Arguments .............. 52, 53
Legal Text .............. 53

PROPOSITION K

With exceptions, would regulate the construction of buildings that cast shadows on parks & playgrounds.

Analysis ............... 54
Arguments .............. 55-58
Legal Text .............. 63

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Roberta Bor- ganova, Stephanie Salter and Susan Kwock. They were assisted by Thomas Toomey of the City Attorney’s Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to
to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. citizen.
• are at least 18 years of age on election day.
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the
crime of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what
political party you consider yours, you can say “independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and
address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you.
If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth
even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls
on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there
or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’
handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your address when you signed up to vote,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Regis-
trar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Regis-
trar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M.
on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
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.

A 第一步
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

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."

B 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 cabezuelas rojas.

C 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.

D 第三步
請把握選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直打入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y págalala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入密封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren't enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as “D-S”; this stands for “Decline to State”.

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 5:

NONPARTISAN VOTERS: You will get an ORANGE ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the orange pages. There are four orange pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS: You will get a RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and the orange pages.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS: You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow page and the orange pages.

LIBERTARIAN VOTERS: You will be given a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue page and orange pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the orange pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
<th>Preferencia Presidencial</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GERALD WILLIS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON “JACK” MOHR</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. LOWREY</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. GLENN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delegates to the National Convention
Delegados a la Convención Nacional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</th>
<th>投選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Representative in Congress
Diputado al Congreso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CANDIDATE FILED</th>
<th>投選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

State Senator, 3rd District
Senador Estatal, Distrito 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CANDIDATE FILED</th>
<th>投選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Member of the Assembly
Miembro de la Asamblea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CANDIDATE FILED</th>
<th>投選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Member, County Central Committee—17th District
Miembro, Comité Central del Candidato—Distrito #17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CANDIDATE FILED</th>
<th>投選11名</th>
<th>Vote por no más de 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Note: This page will be yellow)

If you are affiliated with the American Independent Party,

begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip the next few pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferencia Presidencial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to the National Convention</td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegados a la Convención Nacional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputado al Congreso, Distrito 5</td>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor de Economia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator, 3rd District</td>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador Estatal, Distrito 3</td>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propietario de Pequenos Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly, 17th District</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee—17th District</td>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito #17</td>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propietario de Pequenos Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9  
Continé votando en las páginas de color anaranjado, numeradas 6, 7, 8 y 9  

(Note: This page will be blue)  
If you are affiliated with the Libertarian Party,  
begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip past the red pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.)
If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY, this will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
## Peace & Freedom Party

### Member of the Assembly, 17th District
**Miembro de la Asamblea**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATE FILED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, County Central Committee—17th District
**Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito # 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 15</th>
<th>請投選不超過15名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAY WOODY Typesetter/Tipógrafo/ 拓字工人</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL R. MENEELY Unemployed Truck Driver/Camionero Desempleado/ 失業貨車司機</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FIGUEIREDO Warehouseman/Bodeguero/ 收貨工人</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIANNE DITTON Lesbian Activist/Activista Lesbian/ 女同性戀活動分子</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAYLE M. JUSTICE Director Senior Programs/Director de Programas para Ancianos/ 老人計劃主任</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP BRUCE JOSELYN Community Organizer/Organizador de la Comunidad/ 社會組織者</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA JACKSON Lesbian/Gay Activist/Activista de Lesbianas/Homosexuales/ 男、女同性戀活動分子</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS Socialist Organizer/Organizador Socialista/ 社會主義組織者</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHANIE J. HEDGEcoe Union Printer/Impresor Sindicalista/ 工會會員印刷工人</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONI ARENSTEIN</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEN EVANS Writer/Escritor/ 作家</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN LATHAM</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE C. LA RIVA Childcare Worker/Trabajadora en Cuidado de Niños/ 托兒工作者</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE ADRIAN &quot;TED&quot; ZUUR Waiter/Mesero/ 值班</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Election Primaria 5 de Junio de 1984**

**County Committee**

---

**primary_election**

**Primary Election**

**June 5, 1984**

---

**NOTE: This page will be red**

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote for Yes</th>
<th>Vote for No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>County Jail Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>Yes 163</td>
<td>No 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>Yes 167</td>
<td>No 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>California Park and Recreational Facilities Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>Yes 171</td>
<td>No 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>Yes 175</td>
<td>No 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Elected Officials. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>Yes 180</td>
<td>No 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPORCIONES ESTATELAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163  SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCEL DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárceles de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164  NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167  SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168  NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171  SI</td>
<td>FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Desclaseficiación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es desclaseficado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172  NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Votos:** 163 164 167 168 171 172 175 176 180 181
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

'INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara las haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Específica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependiendo de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavaluación para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades estatales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sosténimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sosténimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

州公務員的豁免。公共僱員退休制度和州教育退休制度的若干指定經理職位可豁免於公務制度，財政影響，無直接影響，但如選擇人員靈活性的增加影響到投資計劃的執行時，則可能產生間接影響。

州務會，規則，程序，權力，撥款，制訂各委員會中各案組成的程序，投票規定和其它事項，削減後勤經費撥款。財政影響，州議會經費支出一九八四至八五財政年度預算規定的撥款減少$37,000,000，一九八四至八五財政年度後，州議會經費的增長將定出最高限制。
 SHALL the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies? 

YES 212 ←
NO 213 ←

SHALL police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits? 

YES 216 ←
NO 217 ←

SHALL entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits? 

YES 221 ←
NO 222 ←

SHALL the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities? 

YES 226 ←
NO 227 ←

SHALL the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities? 

YES 231 ←
NO 232 ←
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los previstos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberá pagarle a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 p.m. y las 7:00 p.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

F. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
<th>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

______________________________________________________________

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
## VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.** (Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presential candidate)</td>
<td>NO 16 163 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Congress Representative</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NO 17 167 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Senator (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NO 18 171 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Assembly</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NO 19 175 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>NO 20 180 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Committee</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NO 21 185 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>NO 22 190 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>NO 23 196 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>NO 24 204 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
<td>NO A 212 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
<td>NO B 216 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
<td>NO C 221 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
<td>NO D 226 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *</td>
<td>NO E 231 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>(Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Commit</em></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tee candidates to vote for.)</td>
<td>NO F 236 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muni Court Judge</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>NO G 240 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>NO H 244 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>NO I 249 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>NO J 253 254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

236 SI 贊成
237 NO 反對

G ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

240 SI 贊成
241 NO 反對

H ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

244 SI 贊成
245 NO 反對

I ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

249 SI 贊成
250 NO 反對

J ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro de los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

253 SI 贊成
254 NO 反對

K ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedad del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212 ▷
NO 213 ▷

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance.

This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it. It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests, because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.

William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.

Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.

VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tong
President, Board of Education

Honorable Sononia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education

Honorable Dick Cerastes
Member, Board of Education

Honorable Libby Denebem
Member, Board of Education

Honorable Eugene Hoop
Member, Board of Education

Honorable Myra Krop
Member, Board of Education
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Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Loosman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migaen
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rossielli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.
San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.
San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Vice President Valley Merchants Association
Joy Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Pachew
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Mihajlovic
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udovec
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.
Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.
Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.
Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Marie O'Brien

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jocke
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shirley Black</th>
<th>Buck Bagot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, Planning Association of the Richmond Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Breyer, Attorney</td>
<td>Diana Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Sneed</td>
<td>Henry Der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia San Felippo</td>
<td>Susan E. Walters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Simpson, Retired</td>
<td>Elizabeth J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kelly Kennedy</td>
<td>Paula Pede</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don't let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don't let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216 NO 217

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major iniquity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers—such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police—and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 1/4% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane Mckaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.”
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
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that our police officers should *definitely* receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!**
San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**YES ON PROPOSITION B**
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and *good government*.

Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:**
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committee Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner
John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate
Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committeeman
Stanley Bronwewll
Republican Central Committeeman
Dennis Mark
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate
Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Lisa Klobuchar
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:**
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committeeman
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman
JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeewoman

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B**

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

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

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive $2\frac{1}{2}$% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service $7\frac{1}{2}$%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- $2\frac{1}{2}$% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- $7\frac{1}{2}$% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent "on-the-front line" fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry... and even other fire departments—grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay "on-the-front line", and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition "C", a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to fire fighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced fire fighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two fire fighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre "TIME SERVED" proposal would raise each fireman's pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual "pay package" for a regular "entry rank" H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O'Keefe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent "Rapid Turnover" problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter's Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1509 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition "C".

If passed, this "longevity of service" premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "C".
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don't clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco's firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the "problem" alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
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Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "E" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "E" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally, since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City's General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy's facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "E" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priorities: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facili-

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!
San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.
Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Water Department Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236

NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees' Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn't be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don't weaken our city's merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!
For good government, let's keep these two positions under place. Civil Service.
Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240
NO 241

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder's duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder's office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder's Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder's job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It's like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City's elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder's office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate "red tape", delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244 ▼

NO 245 ▼

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller's Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters J. A. Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an Initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition "I". Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the "BIG PIE" at City Hall. Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote "YES".

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate
George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate
Robert Guichard
Businessman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner
John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman
Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate
Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on "I" (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Elect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinosa for Congress,

and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
C. Al Castro, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Muscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261
Paul Varrauelli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stuart Bickette
Robert Conning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Clesby
Eric Craven
Gwynn Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs, *
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gile, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greensdoerfer
Roman Guy, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holzclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Anar Jacobs
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph knebloe, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilkoy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Kefling, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph F. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Michael Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Patalones-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Past, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Raya
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Sauve
Tom Saumerner
Stan Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorrier
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "M" Wintrol, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Keating
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace, San Francisco Women’s Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocchi, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Maryline A. Caswell, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yes, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Broyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblentz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Girando
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Han
Richard Cerbolas, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pete Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tam, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Jalice Fang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jett Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlota Tresidder del Portillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente O'Hegian
Al Borvise, Attorney at Law
Jim Moralez
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zaretti L. Gosby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sadonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large. At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
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Jail Cost Reimbursement

PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER

51
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they are able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRAN-
CISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-
2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS
OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL
DETENTION FACILITY.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco:

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administra-
tive Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto,
reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover
Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as
the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of
monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the
California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of
the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, de-
velop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs,
develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the
general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by
a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to
the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and
compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs
of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination
made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed
annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of
incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The
board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is neces-
sary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the
collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California
Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?  

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Darrin
Rebecca Evans

Dan Sweeney
Jack Trajillo
Jane Widdowson
Lonnie Lawson

Toby Rosebudlt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Brennan, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Carl Pope
Miriam Blumenthal
Joyce Hall
Don Hornezy
Robert Murchison
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Halset
Gordon Chinn
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tarro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bystek
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants' Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feser
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hester
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on “K”.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women’s Forum
 Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city's parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let's approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It's entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let's do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco's many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K raises sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote "NO" on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

lems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor

Lex Byers
Executive Director
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said member to exceed such service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon. The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation". Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

A police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided for in this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary assigned to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549. The expression “firemen” as used in said section shall mean firemen employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stroke men, truckmen, or hosenmen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increments schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided. Service shall not qualify as “satisfactory” if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate. Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds herefore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.
(c) Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing Hetch Hetchy water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under the commission’s jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-quarters affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face**; deletions are indicated by *strikethrough.*

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall have experience in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him by the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face**; deletions are indicated by *strikethrough.*

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief ad-
PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

the civil service provisions of this charter; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of executive assistant on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSAL FOR LOCAL ORDINANCE

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1977 shall be for a period of four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified. At the general election in 1977 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the completion of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission during the first hour after sunrise and for the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
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Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. citizen.
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • your address when you signed up to vote,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING
CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1
Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

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

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 cabezitas rojas.

STEP 3
Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4
After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

In Chinese:

第一歩
请双手将选票插入，票尾之二零，插入于二红点之上。

第二歩
请将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，合于二红点之上。

第三歩
请将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，及于二红点之上。

第四歩
投票選挙之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用，
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren’t enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as “D-S”; this stands for “Decline to State”.

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 5:

NONPARTISAN VOTERS: You will get an ORANGE ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the orange pages. There are four orange pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS: You will get a RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and the orange pages.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS: You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow page and the orange pages.

LIBLETARIAN VOTERS: You will be given a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue page and orange pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the orange pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
### AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

#### Presidential Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
<th>Preferencia Presidencial</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GERALD WILLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDÓN &quot;JACK&quot; MOHR</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. LOWREY</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. GLENN</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Delegates to the National Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegates to the National Convention</th>
<th>Delegados a la Convención Nacional</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### NO DELEGATION HAS FILED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CANDIDATE FILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ELECTION PRIMARIA

#### 5 DE JUNIO DE 1984

#### UNITED STATES PRESIDENT OF THE U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative in Congress</th>
<th>Diputado al Congreso</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UNITED STATES SENATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator, 3rd District</th>
<th>Senador Estatal, Distrito 3</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of the Assembly</th>
<th>Miembro de la Asamblea</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COUNTY OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, County Central Committee—17th District</th>
<th>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito #17</th>
<th>請選11名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

A(17) Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9. 請在橙色第6, 7, 8及9頁上繼續投票。

(Note: This page will be yellow)

If you are affiliated with the AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY, begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip the next few pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE BLUE)

If you are affiliated with the
LIBERTARIAN PARTY,

begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip past the red pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace &amp; Freedom Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferencia Presidencial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vote for One |
| Vote por Uno |
| 所選一名 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAVRIELLE HOLMES</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS L. SERRETTE</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Delegates to the National Convention |
| Delegados a la Convención Nacional |

| Vote for One |
| Vote por Uno |
| 所選一名 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Representative in Congress, 5th District |
| Diputado al Congreso, Distrito 5 |

| Vote for One |
| Vote por Uno |
| 所選一名 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE ADRIAN ‘TED’ ZUUR</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no contest for State Senator in this District. There is no contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.

本區沒有州參議員選舉。

Now continue voting on the next page. / Continúe votando en la siguiente página.

1P(17-8-5)

NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE RED)

If you are affiliated with the Peace & Freedom Party,

this will be the first page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of the Assembly, 17th District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea 第十七區州眾議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO CANDIDATE FILED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, County Central Committee—17th District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distrito # 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>緬委員會 縣委員會</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAY WOODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typesetter/Tipógrafo/排字工人</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DANIEL R. MENEELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Truck Driver/Camionero Desempleado/失業貨車司機</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOSEPH FIGUEIREDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warehouseman/Bodeguero/貿易工人</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARIANNE DITTON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian Activist/Activista Lesbianaint/女同性戀活動分子</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAYLE M. JUSTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director Senior Programs/Director de Programas para Ancianos/老人計劃主任</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHILLIP BRUCE JOSSELYN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizador de la Comunidad/社區組織者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATRICIA JACKSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian/Gay Activist/Activista de Lesbianas/Homosexuales/男、女同性戀活動分子</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL KANGAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Organizer/Organizador Socialista/社會主義組織者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPHANIE J. HEDGECOKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Printer/Impresor Sindicalista/工會印刷工人</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TONI ARENSTEIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEN EVANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writer/Escritor/作家</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSAN LATHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENEVIEVE C. LA RIVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Worker/Trabajadora en Cuidado de Niños/托兒工作者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEODORE ADRIAN &quot;TED&quot; ZUUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiter/Mesero/侍者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 110 |
| 111 |
| 112 |
| 113 |
| 114 |
| 115 |
| 116 |
| 117 |
| 118 |
| 119 |
| 120 |
| 121 |
| 122 |
| 123 |

Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9.

(Note: This page will be red)

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

This will be the second page of your ballot. After completing it, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDICIAL</th>
<th>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</th>
<th>158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000. YES 163 NO 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000. YES 167 NO 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes. YES 171 NO 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas. YES 175 NO 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy. YES 180 NO 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Específica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están o no en una fase más alta a más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL EN MIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta al rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD, EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN CONTRA SISMOS. Eximen del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades bienales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Específica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite top se fijó al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

州公務員的退休，公共僱員退休制度和州教育退休制度的若干指定職位可豁免於公務制度。財政影響，無直接影響。但若選擇人員靈活性的增加影響到投資計劃的執行時，則可能產生間接影響。

物業稅，地震安全建築免稅條款，凡因地震安全進行的具體抗震加強設施，可免除物業稅重新估計。財政影響，地方財政物業稅的損失及增加的估計費用，財政影響不詳。州收入減，社區大損。可能還有地方政府的其他收入的損失。所增加的開支數額不詳，由於物業稅扣稅額減低，州所得稅收入略增。

州議會，規則，程序，權力，撥款。州議會各委員會中各委員組的程序，會議規定和其 他 事 項。州減後期經費撥款。州議會經費開支較一九八四年至八五年財政年度的原規定的 拨款減少$37,000,000。一九年四至八五年財 政年度後，州議會經費的增長將定出一最高限 額。
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

A

YES 212
NO 213

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

B

YES 216
NO 217

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

C

YES 221
NO 222

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

E

YES 226
NO 227

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

F

YES 231
NO 232
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo a beneficios adicionales comparables a las provistas a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberá pagarse a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 p.m. y las 7:00 a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos de nivel de entrada que hayan cumplido diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 21/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 3%, y después de veinte años de servicio 71/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Anergía para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

F. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Anergía para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes Votes</th>
<th>No Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

________________________________________

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
**VOTER SELECTION CARD**

**CANDIDATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>YES</strong></th>
<th><strong>NO</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>YES</strong></th>
<th><strong>NO</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)

**Muni Court Judge**

1. ____________

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
236 SI 237 NO
¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

240 SI 241 NO
¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

244 SI 245 NO
¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

249 SI 250 NO
¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro de los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

253 SI 254 NO
¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

1. Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.
   Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let's make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco's growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION "A", we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION "A", our loss will be these cities' and counties' gain.

Take stock in San Francisco's future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers' money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator
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Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION "A" will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn't give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco's labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city's best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco's basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let's keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION "A" will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION "A" would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION "A" would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION "A" would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION "A" gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Solomia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Beneheim
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Koyf
Member, Board of Education
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jon Wachtel
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Saul Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits. Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it's good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaske Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitacion Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Puchow
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philibobian
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udovich
Proprietor, Oceanide Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?
Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women's Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits. Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.
It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luiza P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O'Brien

Virginia Lozano
Cornelia Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.
Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventative health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jacks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Johling
Tessa Ronenval
Ron Huberman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.
San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black  
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond

Charles Breyer, Attorney  
Henry Der

Regina Sneed  
Susan E. Walters

Lydia San Felippo  
Elisabeth Jewel

John J. Simpson, Retired  
Betty Brooks

Susan Kelly Kennedy  
Paula Pede

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O'Keefe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won't have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor's statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can't stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let's not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216

NO 217

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
Police Night Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Pay a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 2/3% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the "high crime" evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city's Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskie Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

"Night Differential" is as basic as "apple pie."

Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
that our police officers should **definitely** receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B:**
San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

*John F. Foran*
State Senator — 8th District

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**YES ON PROPOSITION B**
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco.

Prop B is cost efficient and **good government**.

Vote Yes on Prop B.

*Al Casciato, President*
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

*Don Scott*
Former Chief of Police

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:**

Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

*Robert Silvestri*
Republican Central Committee Candidate

*Max Woods*
Republican State Committee Candidate

*Dr. Terence Faulkner*
Republican Central Committee Candidate

*John Muy*
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**Tom Spinosa**
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**Leslie Payne**
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**Stanley Bramwell**
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**Dennis Mark**
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**Shirley Spinosa**
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**Harry Herpe**
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**Kevin Sullivan**
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**Lisa Klebucar**
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:**
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

*Arlo Hale Smith*
Democratic Central Committee Member

*Alexa Smith*
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

**Bob Geary**
Democratic Central Committee Member

**Patrick Fitzgerald**
Democratic Central Committee Member

**JoAnne Miller**
Democratic Central Committee Member

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B**

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry “goes with the territory”! It is one of the reasons why a regular “entry rank” Q2 Patrolman’s annual “pay package” is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

*William F. O’Keefe, Sr.*
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MEMBER.
Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:

- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.

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

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don't clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco's firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the "problem" alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
1. for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
2. for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
3. for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
4. shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City's water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: "Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
Water Dept. Financing

PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “F” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “F” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section

6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priorities: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application
is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.
Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240

NO 241

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987."

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How "I" Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “T”.

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

State Assembly Candidate

George Rehnert
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

Former City Commissioner

John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “T” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).


Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board's decisions will be less reflective of the voters' thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harvey Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al. Castello, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Labor’s Local 261*
Paul Varnicelli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 399/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Muller
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleasby
Eric Craven
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Nye Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Fayle, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendorfer
Roma Ga, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holtsclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jaics
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kelliker, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kefinman
Steven M. Kreising, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph F. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Palomares-Criollos
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Larry Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Ryan
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Texas Rowell
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Irwin Sils
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gerder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "B" Wester, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "I".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Maryline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Broyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Cobus
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表       June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

申請一份缺席選票給本人，以參加上述所示之選舉。

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA-  正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申請人簽名

DATE-FECHA- 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION- 住址

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

請將選票寄給本人

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente.

Descripción del Impedimento/incapacidad
Iniciales del Volante

FREELAND

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
Prec. No.____________________
Ballot No.___________________
Ballot Mailed_________________
Inspector's Notice_____________
Signature and Registration     
Verified as Correct:_________________

Date
Deputy Registrar
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods’ small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, ensuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hom
Richard Cerbulo, Commissioner, Board of Education
Plus Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wade, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jesse Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which affect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Aynia, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlos Tejedor del Porrallo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Olvera
Al Borrego, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zurend L. Gowdy, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Price, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sadonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I. The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of nineteen members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisioral election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisioral election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter term there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES  249  
NO   250  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Artur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open space is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Robert Crosby
Rev. Henry Davis
Rebecca Evans
Amy Meyer
Keith Eckman
Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Tom Malloy, General Manager

Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans
Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bieman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Landir, Teacher
Willard McCrea
Margaret Brennan
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Baker
Elia Cohn

Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lee
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rafal

Carl Pope
Miriam Blumenheim
Joyce Hall
Don Horanzy
Robert Muchhauer
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Habriel
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Hale
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cassic Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Ronny Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brid Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bystick
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants' Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvin J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feesor
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Muckel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hpton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravinas
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition "K". Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city's parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let's approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-

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

lems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco's architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning's Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California's School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university's simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan's sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan's innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a child's playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is "supposed" to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

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 A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit and said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(l) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(j) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(k) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this chapter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid to members employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of fireman classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stroke men, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve
month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Con-
sumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of in-
crease or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown
by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the cer-
tified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred
to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of
Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor
publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues
the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors
shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact
finding committee to determine the same date pursuant to the methods
therefore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of liv-
ing adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percent-
age of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in
addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same
time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of
compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average
cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of
the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San
Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such
cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be
granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed by
the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of Sep-
tember of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the
police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commis-
sions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to
the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding
citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by
a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living in-
crease shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no
uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July
1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained
herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new com-
promise schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue
until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary in-
crement schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be ex-
 tended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition
against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not
be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no
uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation
is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary re-
duction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for
herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of
compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to super-
sede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sec-
tions, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank
thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory ser-
vice shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.
Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been
suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority
granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately pre-
ceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided
for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise dis-
ciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to
be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of
decision by the chief of the department or the fire commission as appro-
pirate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included
for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions pro-
vided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for addi-
tional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to
the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit
and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen
years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above
the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section
shall be paid;
(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of
twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent
above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this sec-
tion shall be paid;
(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service,
an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as
defined and provided for this section shall be paid.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the
manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.
Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein pro-
vided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period im-
mediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of ser-
vice.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board
of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall
have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose
of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing
water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water
and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under
such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by ap-
propriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accor-
dance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including
amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Re-
venue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54389, inclusive,
of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of
such revenue bonds.
(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate
of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by
the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of
the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained
in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commis-
sion pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor
evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute
and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable sole-
ly out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy
project or from water and power facilities operated or con-
trolled by it.
(c) Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pur-
suant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit
provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent
the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the
purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or de-
veloping Hetch Hetchy water facilities or electric power facilities or
combinations of water and electric power facilities under the com-
mision's jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided
for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be sub-
ject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section
7.300; except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue
bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities,
when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmat-
tive vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.
(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.
(c) Water department revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the commission’s jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeover type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board’s pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
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Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.
The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief administrator, to prescribe general rules and regulations for the administrative service under his control; to have a voice but no vote in the board of supervisors, with the right to report on or to discuss any matter before the said board concerning the affairs of the departments in his charge; to make such recommendations and propose such measures to the mayor, the board of supervisors, or committees thereof, concerning the affairs of the city and county in his charge as he may deem necessary; to coordinate the functioning of the several departments of the city and county charged with powers and duties relating to control of traffic; and to provide for the budgeting and control of publicity and advertising expenditures of the city and county.
The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the register of voters and to occupy the offices of register of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefor to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, “property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission” shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
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### Poll Workers Needed

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

### Wheelchair Accessibility:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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### PROPOSITIONS

#### PROPOSITION A
Would empower the Supervisors to grant employee benefits under certain circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION B
Would grant night differential pay to police officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION C
Would grant additional pay to firefighters with 10, 15 and 20 years of satisfactory service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
<td>35, 59-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION D
Proposition D was withdrawn by the Board of Supervisors on March 12.

#### PROPOSITION E
Would allow certain types of Hetch Hetchy bonds to be issued without going on the ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37, 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION F
Would allow certain types of Water Department bonds to be issued without going on the ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39, 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION G
Would allow the appointment of 2 Retirement System managers, exempt from the Civil Service process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION H
Would establish the Recorder as an independent agency, under the CAO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62, 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION I
Would reduce the number of Supervisors from 11 to 7 and would change supervisiorial elections to odd-numbered years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>50, 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION J
Would allow the City to charge prisoners for the cost of jail, if they can afford to pay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>52, 53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROPOSITION K
With exceptions, would regulate the construction of buildings that cast shadows on parks & playgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Legal Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>55-58</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Roberta Boganova, Stephanie Salter and Susan Kwok. They were assisted by Thomas Toomey of the City Attorney’s Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. citizen.
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • your address when you signed up to vote,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
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**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**SPECIAL NOTE**

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

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de 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."

**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 cabezuelas rojas.

**STEP 3**

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

**STEP 4**

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
EXPLANATION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

At primary elections there aren’t enough voting machines to assign a separate machine to each party at each precinct; therefore, some of the machines will have to handle more than one party.

In each precinct we have assigned one or two voting machines to handle the ballots of the nonpartisan voters and the voters belonging to the American Independent Party, the Peace and Freedom Party and the Libertarian Party.

Since all four types of voters will be using the same machine (but with different ballots) it is possible that some confusion might result, so it is important that you study these pages carefully.

If you are in doubt as to what party you are affiliated with, check the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party affiliation appears above your name and address. Nonpartisan voters (those who have no party) are indicated on the address label as “D-S”; this stands for “Decline to State”.

Here is what you can expect when you go to your polling place on June 5:

NONPARTISAN VOTERS: You will get an ORANGE ballot card. Go into the appropriately marked booth. Inside the booth you will vote on only the orange pages. There are four orange pages numbered 6, 7, 8 and 9.

PEACE & FREEDOM VOTERS: You will get a RED ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the red pages and the orange pages.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT VOTERS: You will get a YELLOW ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the yellow page and the orange pages.

LIBERTARIAN VOTERS: You will be given a BLUE ballot card. Go into the special booth and vote on both the blue page and orange pages.

In other words, everyone votes on the orange pages of the voting machine and, in addition, members of the three smaller parties also vote on the color-coded page(s) that match the color of the ballot card that they are given.
# AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

## Presidential Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. J. LOWREY</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. GLENN</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALD WILLIS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON “JACK” MOHR</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Delegates to the National Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegates</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Representative in Congress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## State Senator, 3rd District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member of the Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member, County Central Committee—19th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 2</th>
<th>最多限選二名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO CANDIDATE FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

A(19) Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 請在橙色第6，7，8及9頁上繼續投票。

---

(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE YELLOW)

If you are affiliated with the AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY,

‘begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip the next few pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
### Libertarian Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote Information</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference Presidencial</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for one Person</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to the National Convention</td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegados a la Convenación Nacional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for one Person</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputado al Congreso, Distrito 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for one Person</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator, 3rd District</td>
<td>MARK PICKENS</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador Estatal, Distrito 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for one Person</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly, 19th District</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for one Person</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee—19th District</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Comité Central del Condado—Distri#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>縣區中央委員會委員，第十九郡區</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for no more than one Person</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now continue voting on the ORANGE PAGES, Numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 請在橙色第6，7，8及9
Continé votando en las páginas de color anaranjado, numeradas 6, 7, 8 y 9 頁上橘色投票。

(Note: This page will be blue)

If you are affiliated with the Libertarian Party,

begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, skip past the red pages and go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
## PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS L. SERRETTE</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAVRIELLE HOLMES</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delegates to the National Convention
Entregadores a la Convención Nacional

| NO DELEGATION HAS FILED |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative in Congress, 5th District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEODORE ADRIAN 'TED' ZUUR</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator, 3rd District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No candidates have filed for State Assembly or County Committee

**NOW CONTINUE VOTING ON THE ORANGE PAGES, NUMBERED 6, 7, 8 & 9**

**CONTINÚE VOTANDO EN LAS PÁGINAS DE COLOR AÑARANJADO, NUMERADAS 6, 7, 8 Y 9**

*(NOTE: THIS PAGE WILL BE RED)*

If you are affiliated with the PEACE & FREEDOM PARTY,

begin your voting on this page. After completing this page, go on to the pages numbered 6, 7, 8 & 9 to vote for judges and propositions. On your voting machine those pages will be colored orange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE**

**JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL**

Oficina Número Uno 第一庭

**VOTE POR UNO** 限選一人

**JUDICIAL**

**DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

1. **ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLO DE CAPITAL PARA CÁRCEL DE CONDADO DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárcel de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.

2. **ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVOS PRISIONES DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.

3. **ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.

4. **ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la especificada adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.

5. **FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS.** Desclasificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato opONENTE. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es desclasificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS. Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los hberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Específica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependerá de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alto a más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades binales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por 337 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite top se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?  

A  | YES 212  | NO 213  

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?  

B  | YES 216  | NO 217  

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?  

C  | YES 221  | NO 222  

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?  

E  | YES 226  | NO 227  

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?  

F  | YES 231  | NO 232  

8E
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los previstos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberán pagárselos a los oficiales de policía un 6,25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hatch Hetch para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

F. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Agua para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

______________________________

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to "yes" or "no." This number will appear on your ballot.

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTER SELECTION CARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANDIDATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.** (**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presential candidate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Committee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *                  (*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</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>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
G: ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H: ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I: ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J: ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado o otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K: ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES  212

NO   213

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

PULLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let's make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco's growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION "A", we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers' money.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION "A", our loss will be these cities' and counties' gain.

Take stock in San Francisco's future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION "A" is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION "A" will keep San Francisco's best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it's harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America's best-run cities.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let's hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION "A" will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn't give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco's labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city's best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco's basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let's keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION "A" will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION "A" would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION "A" would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION "A" would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION "A" gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.
VOTE FOR PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sadonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Ceballos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Benefield
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education

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

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission

Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission

Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Warren DeMerritt
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, San Francisco Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Leeman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it's good government.

Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitacion Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Pachew
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philhobian
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udovich
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bar-

gain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church

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

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance? Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandval A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O'Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outdated, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaicks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tess Rowerald
Ron Huberman

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

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.
San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.
Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.
Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black  
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond 
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.
Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.
Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.
This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.
So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.
Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.
The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of govern-

ment, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970’s, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Republican County Committeeman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata
Republican County Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election

29
Police Night Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress

Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress

Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District

Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Michael Hennessy
Sheriff
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 1/4% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not. This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.). The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.” Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe

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

that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner

John Moy
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Lisa Klobucar
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committee

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeeewoman

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police

Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEeman.

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

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento,
San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juania Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don't clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226
NO 227

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
Hetch Hetchy Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance, and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facili-

(Continued on page 61)
Water Dept. Financing

PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F"

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Water Department Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)

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

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

The Text of Proposition G appears on page 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County-School whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Superior Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES  240
NO   241

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Robert Guichard
Businessman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner
John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committee
Tom Spinoso
Republican Congressional Candidate
Shirley Spinoso
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Elect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinoso for Congress, and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Francisco needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Cucchiato, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardi, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckles
Robert Causing, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Clearby
Eric Craven
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals *
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gayle, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendorfer
Roma Gay, Co-director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holzclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jaicks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kellifer, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margaret Kaufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Palomares-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Raya
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Reaverel
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, A.D. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther “b” Woest, CLU *
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Marra Realey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lee O’Shen, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Mindyline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne F. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Willams, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

● grow
● provide jobs
● raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblenz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTEAUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

[signature]

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA-
正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA-
申請人簽名

DATE-FECHA-
日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION-
住址:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor enviéme la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above
Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requisitos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente.

Description of Impediment/Incapacity

[signature]

Votante’s Initials

Initialles del Votante
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO
DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 29 DE MAYO DE 1984,
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hore
Richard Cerbates, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlota Texidor de Porritio, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Obregon
Al Borvica, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Fynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zarett L. Gosby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sodonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I. The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”

Jim Wachob · President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249
NO 250

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Satro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madilyn A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can't be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It's only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they're convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1, Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253
NO  254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition "K".

Support Proposition "K".

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition "J" to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public's right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition "K". Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION K:

A "YES" vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City's green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco's Recreation and Park facilities are the "lungs" of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON "K"

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY'S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Willinda McCrea
William Kuhus
Margaret Brennan
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Bulkeley
Ela Cohn

Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lee
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rafal

Robert Kramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Duras
Rebecca Evans

Toby Rosenthal, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Biernau, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hannicott
Carol Negro
Arden Danetakas
Heide Chipp
Tim Lillyquist
Dick Grosholl
John Holzclaw

Carl Page
Miriam Blumstein
Joyce Hall
Don Hornsey
Robert Muehlonger
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Hulted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical “common sense” politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Halse
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Bonafice Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Lavoy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bystie
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants’ Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvin J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feuer
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Morschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on “K”.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women’s Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, cases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks; some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

Problems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed to” know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

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 A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevaling Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, subject to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay and time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefore for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”. Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The pay of other women protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may re-ward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the average rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification; (2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class; (3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and (4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, which includes range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation". Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1952, as amended and "compensation capable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, fillmen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, to set forth, without regard to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said index, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinabove provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(c) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(b) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no

uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.

Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

eties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereafter or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities, or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him by the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 9th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 6th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 6th day of January 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to success these members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected; and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: the four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and other (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48
Application para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. citizen.
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • your address when you signed up to vote,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
### Delegate Listing

**Democratic Party**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Weissberg (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest A. Bates (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herma Hill Kay (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry A. Francois (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadie Redd (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy L. Larson (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Lin (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Walter (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Republican Party**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry Brit (GARY HART)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Varner (GARY HART)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holitzlaw (GARY HART)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Thomas (GARY HART)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Lee (GARY HART)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance O'Connor (GARY HART)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Henry Kouba (GARY HART)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Torell (GARY HART)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Lantz (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn K. Lantz (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. Kilber (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Kilber (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael R. Hodges (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy L. Huffman (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew A. Klein (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Konviser Ingraham (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Democrats Please Note:**

This year the method of voting for president is different than at previous elections. Instead of voting for one presidential candidate, you will be voting for eight delegates. Pages 1 and 2 contain the names of 48 citizens who want to be delegates at the Democratic Convention to be held here in San Francisco. Each would-be delegate is pledged to support one of the six presidential candidates. The names of the presidential candidates are printed in bold let-

*(Continued on bottom of page 5)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</th>
<th>Vote por no más de 8 delegados</th>
<th>請投選8名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55 Doris M. Ward (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>48 delegates are listed on pages 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
<td>48 delegados listados en págs. 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Sal Rosselli (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Lucy Blake (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Timothy J. Twomey (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Linda Post (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Jack Trujillo (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Carole Migden (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Catherine Jean Dodd (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Donna Lee Horn (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Paul H. Melbostad (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Katherine G. Flynn (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Robert Swingley (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Janis Alvarado (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 H. Jackson Zinn (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Gael Sapiro (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Craig W. Campbell (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Howard Gloyd (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td>48 delegates are listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
<td>48 delegados listados en págs. 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Amos C. Brown (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Mabel Sikkel Teng (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 George M. Raya (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Marie Parks (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Ben Madrid (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 A. Billy S. Jones (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Julianne Malveaux (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF PRESIDENTIAL DELEGATE LISTING

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

ters right below the would-be delegates names. Each presidential candidate has a slate of eight (8) delegates; the slates of delegates have been grouped together for your convenience.

You will probably want to cast your eight votes for the slate of 8 delegates representing the presidential candidate of your choice. If you do not want to do this, you can split your eight votes among two or more slates of delegates.

Under no circumstances should you vote for more than eight delegates (you may, however, vote for less than eight, if you wish).
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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."

B 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.
Pase 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coincidan con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
请确认将選票插入時，票尾之二孔，恰好對著二紅點之上。

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 plumas ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把帶鎖之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y péngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。

(Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.)
### Representative in Congress — 5th District
**Diputado al Congress — Distrito #5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALA BURTON</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputado al Congress, Distrito #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVELYN K. LANTZ</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.

### Member of the Assembly — 16th Assembly District
**Miembro de la Asamblea — Distrito #16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ART AGNOS</strong></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assemblyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asambleista Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

**ELECCION PRIMARIA 5 DE JUNIO DE 1984**

**STATE SENATOR**

**PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1994**

**MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY — ASAMBLEA ESTATAL**

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

**ELECCION PRIMARIA 5 DE JUNIO DE 1994**

**STATE SENATOR**

**PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1994**

**MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY — ASAMBLEA ESTATAL**
MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
16th DISTRICT
MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO — DISTRITO #16
民主黨縣區中央委員會委員，第十六選區

Vote for no more than 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Roles</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE WONG</td>
<td>President, AAFUM/President, AAFUM/</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICIA C.W. WANG</td>
<td>Educational Specialist/Especialista Educativo/</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM WACOB</td>
<td>Manager, Senior Programs/Gerente, Programas para Ancianos/</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH WALLER</td>
<td>Project Director/Consultant/Director de Proyecto/Consultor/</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANSY PONZIO WALLER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOORE</td>
<td>Deputy Sheriff/Delegado del Sheriff/</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATSY MORAN</td>
<td>Political Action Coordinator/Coordinadora de Acción Política/</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE BRADY</td>
<td>Investigator/Consultant/Consultora</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDDIE BACA</td>
<td>Organizer/Organizador/</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN BEHANNA</td>
<td>Businessman, Neighborhood Conservationist/Hombre de Negocios, Preservador del Vecindario/</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK TRUJILLO</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVE JONES</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBY JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Advertising Sales Representative/Representante de Ventas Publicitarias/</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY TIMOTHY O'ROURKE</td>
<td>Computer Operator/Operador de Computadora/</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O'CONNOR</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contest Continued on Next Page

VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 10
ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED

VOT POR NO MAS DE 10 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS
(Continúa en la siguiente página)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote for no more than 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>134</strong> STEVEN M. KREFTING Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>135</strong> VICKI COFFEY KEVAK Teacher/Maestra/教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>136</strong> RICHARD KELLEY Professor of Government/Profesor de Gobierno/政治學教授</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>137</strong> EDWIN R. RAMOS Retail Clerk/Empleado Detallista/零售文員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>138</strong> WALDEMAR EDWARD RADTKE, JR. Tradesman Mechanic/Mecánico de Oficio 傳統技工</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>139</strong> PAUL E. SWANSON Maintenance Supervisor/Supervisor de Mantenimiento/維修管理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>140</strong> STAN SMITH Labor Union Official/Oficial de Sindicato Laboral/ 工會業員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>141</strong> JAMES SHOCH Political Organizer/Organizador Político 政治活動組織人員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>142</strong> MICHAEL D. NOLAN Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 現任委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>143</strong> GUIDO E. NANNINI Horticulturist/Horticultor/園藝家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>144</strong> LINDA POST S.F. County Chair/Ir. en el Condado de S.F./舊金山縣主席</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>145</strong> DAVID R. PACHECO Management Consultant/Consultor en Gerencia/管理顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>146</strong> DENNIS PERON Marijuan Reform Advocate/Partidario Para La Reforma de Marihuana/大麻改革倡議人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>147</strong> DARYL COX Administrative Assistant/Asistente Administrativo/行政助理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>148</strong> RAY J. ANTONIO TWU Executive Vice-President/Vice-President Ejecutivo de TWU/ TWU副主席</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>149</strong> HILARY LOUISE LAMAR Attorney/Abogada/律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>150</strong> JAMES GRAHAM Retired/Jubilado/ 已退休</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 10 ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED**

**VOTE POR NO MAS DE 10 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS**
JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR
Judge of Municipal Court

JONATHAN McCURDY
Tenant Attorney

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

16 COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.

YES 163
NO 164

17 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.

YES 167
NO 168

18 CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.

YES 171
NO 172

19 FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.

YES 175
NO 176

20 ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate’s defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.

YES 180
NO 181
**DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES**

1. **ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CÁRCELES DE CONDADO DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.

2. **ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUERAS PRISIONES DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones corregionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.

3. **ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.

4. **ACTA DE ENGRANDECIENDE DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la especificada adquisición, engranecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito nacional.

5. **FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS.** Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los ha-
beles de los fondos como fondos fiduciarios. Es-
pecifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto
fiscal: NIngún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto depen-
dería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos
están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad
adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL EN-
MIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servi-
cio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de
Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de
Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: NIngún efecto
directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibili-
dad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendi-
miento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE
CONSTRUCCIÓN CONTRA SISMOS. EN-
MIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye el
reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones
o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad
contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de
reíditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y
aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de
costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de reíditos de los
distritos escolares y de las universidades, o los gobiernos locales por pérdida
de reíditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los
reíditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción
en los reíditos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES,
CONSORCIO. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la
composición paritaria de los comités, de los requisitos
para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el
sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sosteni-
miento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta
por S77 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera
asignada. Después de 1984-85, un ínimo tope se fija al
crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

公共退休金的投資，修改投資規定，宣佈退休
金為信託基金，具有一定風險，進一步投資的準
則。財政影響：無直接財政影響，間接影響為
公共退休基金投資額的增加和投資組合的靈活性
的增加或下降的情況。

州公務員的退休，公共僱員退休制度和州教育
退休制度的若干規定已經撤除，其影響於公務制
度。財政影響：無直接影響，但如選擇人員靈
活性的增加影響到投資計劃的執行時，則可能
產生間接影響。

物業稅，地震安全建築物及保值。凡因地震安
全的安全規定而導致損失，可免除物業稅
再評估。財政影響：地方財政物業稅收入的增
加及增加的估價費用，其影響不大。財政影響
變動。財政大約，可能還有地方財政的其他收
入的減少，所增加的估價費用不詳，由於物業
稅扣稅標準低，稅所得稅入賬增加。
### Nonpartisan Ballot

**City & County Propositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarle a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

SI 贵成

NO 反对

A

¿Debe pagar sueldos a los oficiales de policia un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

SI 贵成

NO 反对

B

¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio del 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio del 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

SI 贵成

NO 反对

C

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

SI 贵成

NO 反对

D

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

SI 贵成

NO 反对

E

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Educación para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

SI 贵成

NO 反对

F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP.</th>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES 236</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES 240</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES 244</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES 249</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES 253</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

___________________________________________________________

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to "yes" or "no." This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
**VOTER SELECTION CARD**

**CANDIDATES**

| President | 1 or 8.**
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------
|           | (**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presidential candidate)**
| U.S. Congress Representative | 1.
| State Senator (if applicable) | 1.
| State Assembly | 1.
| County Committee* | 1.
| 2.
| 3.
| 4.
| 5. *
| 6. *
| 7. *
| 8. *
| 9. *
| 10. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STATE PROPOSITIONS</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

("Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.")

**Muni Court Judge**

| 1.

**WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Texto en Español</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Retirar el sistema de jubilaciones voluntarias de los empleados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Retirar el sistema de jubilaciones voluntarias de los empleados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Retirar el sistema de jubilaciones voluntarias de los empleados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro de los costos de encarcelación en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Retirar el sistema de jubilaciones voluntarias de los empleados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 254    | NO   | Retirar el sistema de jubilaciones voluntarias de los empleados.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let's make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco's growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION "A", we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION "A", our loss will be these cities' and counties' gain.

Take stock in San Francisco's future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers' money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.
Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

San Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Susan Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Borenow
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Louman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Keily
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits. Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bar-

gain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luis P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O’Brien

Virginia Losada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaicks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tessa Rouveral
Ron Haberman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Snead
Lydia San Filippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy
Buck Bagget
Diane Jacks
Henry Der
Susan E. Walters
Elizabeth Jewel
Betty Brooks
Paula Pede

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216

NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress

Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress

Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District

Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6½% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not. This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M.— those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.” Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
Police Night Pay

that our police officers should *definitely* receive it as well.
I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

*Ernest "Chuck" Ayala*

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!**
San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

*John F. Foran*
State Senator — 8th District

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**YES ON PROPOSITION B**
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and *good government*.

*Al Casciato, President*
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.

*Don Scott*
Former Chief of Police

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:**
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

*Robert Silvestri*
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

*Max Woods*
Republican State Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

*Dr. Terence Faulkner*
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

*John May*
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

*Leslie Payne*
Republican Central Committeeman

*Stanley Bramwell*
Republican Central Committeeman

*Dennis Mark*
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

*Shirley Spinosa*
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

*Harry Herpe*
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

*Kevin Sullivan*
Republican Central Committeeman

*Lisa Klooucar*
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:**
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

*Arlo Hale Smith*
Democratic Central Committeeman

*Alexa Smith*
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

*Bob Geary*
Democratic Central Committeeman

*Patrick Fitzgerald*
Democratic Central Committeeman

*JoAnne Miller*
Democratic Central Committeewoman

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B**

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

*William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.*
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

---

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

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2 1/2% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7 1/2% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry … and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition “C” will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition “C” simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification; (2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class; (3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and (4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226
NO 227

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
Hetch Hetchy Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the City and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facili-

(Continued on page 51)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
 ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to ap-

prove or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section

6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236

NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet. Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees' Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn't be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don't weaken our city's merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let's keep these two positions under Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240
NO 241

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder's duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder's office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder's Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder's job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It's like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City's elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder's office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate "red tape", delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition "I".

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the "BIG PIE" at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote "YES".

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate

George Rehm
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner

John Mey
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Shmuel Bamek
Republican Central Committee

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on "I" (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).


Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscans against San Franciscans. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco's voters.

The people behind this proposition aren't telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won't be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won't work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won't make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can't run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It's time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblymember Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al. Castelo, President, S.F. Police Officers' Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women's Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Maher
Sue Bieman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bards, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleasby
Eric Craven
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engman, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendyke
Roma Gay, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holtschau, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jaacks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kelliker, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kityo, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerthry, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Palomares-Criollos
Walker Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Raya
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rowerol
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thoman, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther “b” Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Delph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Madeline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*
*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:
- grow
- provide jobs
- raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Cohlenz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

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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APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT

APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

缺席選票申請表  

June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:  
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加上表所示之選舉。

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA-  

正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA-  

申請人簽名

DATE-FECHA-  

日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION-  

住址:

Please mail ballot to me at:  
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above  

Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

永久缺席選民

本人在此申請永久缺席選民身份。根據選舉法典第 1451 條及第 151 條之規定，請寄送永久缺席選民身份的申請。

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability  

Voter’s Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE

Por la presente solicito clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente.

Descripción del Impedimento/Incapacidad

Iniciales del Volante
FROM:


DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which affect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

---

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed

(Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn't have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it's working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let's put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they're able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn't result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can't afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco's Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Suro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madeline A. Case
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisioral election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisioral election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney, a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES  249

NO  250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47.00 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Brit, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham  
Beverly Ann Grove  
H.P. Wright  
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253

NO 254

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller's Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition "K".

Support Proposition "K".

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition "J" to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public's right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition "K". Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION K!

A "YES" vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City's green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinar
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco's Recreation and Park facilities are the "lungs" of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON "K"

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY'S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Willa McRae
William Rubin
Margaret Bremner
Nancy Brown
Jonathan Butlery
Julia Cahn
Jack Kaiser
Beth Landis
Nancy Larson
Evelyn Leцы
Richard Livingston
Bruce Refal

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans
Toby Rosenthal, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner
Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hummerv
Carol Negro
Adren Dantes
Heide Chipp
Tim Llubiyast
Dick Groshoff
John Holtzclaw

Carl Pope
Miriam Blockstein
Joyce Hall
Don Horanze
Robert Morldrner
Shelley J. Herzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Robertito Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bysiek
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants' Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feener
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city's parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let's approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It's entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let's do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco's many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-

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

VOTE NO ON "K"

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formular.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department shall report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.
(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.
(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
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to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of the charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commissioner who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the average wages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall in-clude the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be setup by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the work being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers,fillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
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ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for the purchase, construction and replacement of the public utilities commission owned and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54386, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
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principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407(e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
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3.670 Board Composition
The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him by the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary
The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board’s pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
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Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.
The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief adm-

ministrative officer, to prescribe general rules and regulations for the administrative service under his control; to have a voice but no vote in the board of supervisors, with the right to report on or discuss any matter before the said board concerning the affairs of the departments in his charge; to make such recommendations and propose such measures to the mayor, the board of supervisors, or committees thereof, concerning the affairs of the city and county in his charge as he may deem necessary; to coordinate the functioning of the several departments of the city and county charged with powers and duties relating to control of traffic; and to provide for the budgeting and control of publicity and advertising expenditures of the city and county.

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the offices of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefor to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint his executive assistant who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter:
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those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981 shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years, the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected; and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

**NOTE:** This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height, structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall approve the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48

Application para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
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POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER  
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?  
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?  
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. citizen.
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?  
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?  
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?  
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?  
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?  
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?  
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?  
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?  
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?  
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?  
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?  
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?  
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?  
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?  
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there
   • mailing the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?  
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?  
A—You must write:
   • your address when you signed up to vote,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?  
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING  
CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate Listing</th>
<th>Vote por no mas de 8 delegados</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry Brit</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Varner</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holtclaw</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Thomas</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Lee</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance O’Connor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Henry Kuba</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Toreli</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Lantz</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn K. Lantz</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. Kliber</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Kliber</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael R. Hodgkins</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy L. Huffman</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew A. Klein</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Konviter Ingraham</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Weissberg</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest A. Bates</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herma Hill Kay</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry A. Francois</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadie Redd</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy L. Larson</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Lin</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Walter</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELEGATES LISTING CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

**DEMOCRATS PLEASE NOTE:**

This year the method of voting for president is different than at previous elections. Instead of voting for one presidential candidate, you will be voting for eight delegates.

Pages 1 and 2 contain the names of 48 citizens who want to be delegates at the Democratic Convention to be held here in San Francisco. Each would-be delegate is pledged to support one of the six (6) presidential candidates. The names of the presidential candidates are printed in bold let-

(Continued on bottom of page 5)
## Vote for no more than 8 delegates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Delegate Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Doris M. Ward</td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sal Rosselli</td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Lucy Blake</td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Timothy J. Twomey</td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Linda Post</td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Jack Trujillo</td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Carole Migden</td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Catherine Jean Dodd</td>
<td>WALTER MONDALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Donna Lee Horn</td>
<td>GEORGE MCGOVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Paul H. Melbostad</td>
<td>GEORGE MCGOVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Katherine G. Flynn</td>
<td>GEORGE MCGOVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Robert Swingley</td>
<td>GEORGE MCGOVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Janis Alvarado</td>
<td>GEORGE MCGOVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>H. Jackson Zinn</td>
<td>GEORGE MCGOVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Gael Sapir</td>
<td>GEORGE MCGOVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Craig W. Campbell</td>
<td>GEORGE MCGOVERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Howard Gloyd</td>
<td>JESSE JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Amos C. Brown</td>
<td>JESSE JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mabel Sikmei Teng</td>
<td>JESSE JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>George M. Raya</td>
<td>JESSE JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Marie Parks</td>
<td>JESSE JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Ben Madrid</td>
<td>JESSE JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>A. Billy S. Jones</td>
<td>JESSE JACKSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Julianne Malveaux</td>
<td>JESSE JACKSON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 delegates are listed on pages 1 & 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.

### Democratic Party

5 DE JUNIO DE 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Delegate Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 delegates are listed on pages 1 & 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.

END OF PRESIDENTIAL DELEGATE LISTING

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

You will probably want to cast your eight votes for the slate of 8 delegates representing the presidential candidate of your choice. If you do not want to do this, you can split your eight votes among two or more slates of delegates.

Under no circumstances should you vote for more than eight delegates (you may, however, vote for less than eight, if you wish).
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."

A 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 cabezuelas rojas.

B 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，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 perforre con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

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

(Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.)
### Representative in Congress — 5th District

**SALA BURTON**  
Representative in Congress, 5th District  
Diputado al Congress, Distrito #5  
84

**EVELYN K. LANTZ**  
Consultant  
Consultora  
86

### State Senator — 3rd Senatorial District

**LIA BELL**  
Trade Negotiator/Conservationist  
Negociador de Comercio/Aboga Por La Conservación  
93

**JUDY L. HUFFMAN**  
Businesswoman  
Mujer de Negocios  
95

### Member of the Assembly — 16th Assembly District

**ART AGNOS**  
State Assemblyman  
Asambleista Estatal  
103
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE WONG</td>
<td>President, AAFUM/Presidente, AAFUM</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICIA C.W. WANG</td>
<td>Educational Specialist/Especialista Educacional</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM WACHOB</td>
<td>Manager, Senior Programs/Gerente, Programas para Ancianos</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH WALLER</td>
<td>Project Director/Consultant/Director de Proyecto/Consultor</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANSY PONZIO WALLER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS MOORE</td>
<td>Deputy Sheriff/Delegado del Sheriff</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTY MORAN</td>
<td>Political Action Coordinator/Coordinadora de Acción Política</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE BRADY</td>
<td>Investigator/Consultant/Investigadora/Consultora</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDDIE BACA</td>
<td>Organizer/Organizador</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN BEHANNA</td>
<td>Businessman, Neighborhood Conservationist/Hombre de Negocios, Preservadores del Vecindario</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK TRUJILLO</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVE JONES</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBY JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Advertising Sales Representative/Representante de Ventas Publicitarias</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY TIMOTHY O’ROURKE</td>
<td>Computer Operator/Operador de Computadora</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O’CONNOR</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for no more than 10 on both pages combined

Vote por no mas de 10 en ambas paginas combinadas

(Contest Continued on Next Page)

VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 10
ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED

(Continua en la siguiente pagina)

兩頁總共最多限選十名

（下頁尚有競選者名單）
|     | 134  | 135  | 136  | 137  | 138     | 139     | 140  | 141  | 142  | 143  | 144  | 145  | 146  | 147  | 148  | 149  | 150  |
|-----|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|     | STEVEN M. KREFTING | VICKI COFFEY KEYAK | RICHARD KELLEY | EDWIN R. RAMOS | WALDEMAR EDWARD RADTKE, JR. | PAUL E. SWANSON | STAN SMITH | JAMES SHOCH | MICHAEL D. NOLAN | GUIDO E. NANNINI | LINDA POST | DAVID R. PACHECO | DENNIS PERON | DARRYL COX | RAY J. ANTONIO | HILARY LOUISE LAMAR | JAMES GRAHAM |
|     | Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 现任委员 | Teacher/Maestra/ 教师 | Professor of Government/Profesor de Gobierno/ 政治學教授 | Retail Clerk/Empleado Detallista/ 商務文員 | Tradesman Mechanic/Mecánico de Oficio 根据技工 | Maintenance Supervisor/Supervisor de Mantenimiento/ 维修主管 | Labor Union Official/Oficial de Sindicato Laboral/ 工會職員 | Political Organizer/Organizador Político 政治活動組織人員 | Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 现任委员 | Horticulturist/Horticultor/ 植物學家 | S.F. County Chair/Jefe en el Condado de S.F./ 市長候選人 | Management Consultant/Consultor en Gerencia/ 管理顧問 | Marijuana Reform Advocate/Partidario Para La Reforma de Marihuana/ 大麻改革倡議人 | Administrative Assistant/Asistente Administrativo/ 行政助理 | TWU Executive Vice-President/Vice-Presidente Ejecutivo de TWU/ TWU 副主席 | Attorney/Abogada/ 律師 | Retired/Jubilado/ 退休 |

VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 10 ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED
VOTE POR NO MAS DE 10 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS

民主黨

民主黨
### JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Elected Officials. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLESO DE CAPITAL PARA CONCEJAL DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone de la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y remodelaje de cárcel de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone de la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1994. Esta acta dispone de una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la específica adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, or restauración de bienes raíces, parques, playas, áreas de recreación or para preservación histórica.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1994. Esta acta dispone de una emisión de bonos por $55,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la especificada adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales y se requiere de una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS. Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los hábitos de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite. 公共退休金的投资，修改投资规则，允许退休金作为信托基金，具体规定受托人进行投资的条件。财政影响：无直接财政影响。间接影响通过公共退休基金投资是否得到很大的灵活性而受到较高或下降的情况。

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos del director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones. 州公务员的豁免。公共雇员退休制度和州教育退休制度的若干指定经理职位可免除于公职制度。财政影响：无直接影响。但如招聘人员灵活性的增加影响到投资计划的执行时，则可能产生间接影响。

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del gravamen para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades bienales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad. 物业税。地震安全建筑减免税。凡因地震安全进行的特殊指定重建工程，可免除物业税重新评估。财政影响：地方政府的净税收的损失及增加的估值费用，其数额不明。州为补偿学校、社区大学，可能还须向地方政府的其他收入的损失，所增加的开支数额不详。由于物业税扣税额减少，州所得税收入略增。

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura. 州议会，规则，程序，权力。存款。制定各委员会中各组成的程序，投票规定和其他事项，削减年度经费拨款。财政影响：州议会经费预算在1984-85财政年度的拨款减少$37,000,000。1984-85年度财政年度后，州议会经费的增加将处于一最高限额。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarle a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B ¿Deberán pagárselos a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 de p.m. y las 7:30 de p.m., stipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
G
Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

H
Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240
NO 241

I
Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

J
Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249
NO 250

K
Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253
NO 254
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

## CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presentional candidate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Congress Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. _______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Committee*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. _______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. _______________ |
| 3. _______________ |
| 4. _______________ |
| 5. _______________ |
| 6. _______________ |
| 7. _______________ |
| 8. _______________ |
| 9. _______________ |
| 10. _______________ |

(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muni Court Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. _______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STATE PROPOSITIONS

| 16 | 163 | 164 |
| 17 | 167 | 168 |
| 18 | 171 | 172 |
| 19 | 175 | 176 |
| 20 | 180 | 181 |
| 21 | 185 | 186 |
| 22 | 190 | 191 |
| 23 | 196 | 197 |
| 24 | 204 | 205 |

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

| 21 | 212 | 213 |
| 22 | 216 | 217 |
| 23 | 221 | 222 |
| 24 | 226 | 227 |
| 25 | 231 | 232 |
| 26 | 236 | 237 |
| 27 | 240 | 241 |
| 28 | 244 | 245 |
| 29 | 249 | 250 |
| 30 | 253 | 254 |

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1994 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1996, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíba los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES: 212 | NO: 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: "Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulas. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?

1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco. Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance.

This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by deflections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.

William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.

Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.

VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education

Honorable Sondria Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education

Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education

Honorable Libby Donelhein
Member, Board of Education

Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education

Honorable Myra Krup
Member, Board of Education

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren DeMerritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits. Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane Mckaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does. San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making difficult decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitation Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Fuches
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philofoxian
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udovich
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglass Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O’Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outdated, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jacks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Texs Roweral
Ron Huberman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy
Buck Bagot
Diann Jaiks
Henry DeR
Susan E. Walters
Elisabeth Jewel
Betty Brooks
Paula Pele

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
Police Night Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition "B" will bring fairness and equity to the City's work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition "B" would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition "B" grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition "B". It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City's Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff's Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, "night differential" certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6¼% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not. This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.” Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco.
Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faughtner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committeeman

John May
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate

Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committeeman

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeewoman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry “goes with the territory”! It is one of the reasons why a regular “entry rank” Q2 Patrolman’s annual “pay package” is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O’Keefe, Sr.
President.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association.

Republican County Committeeman.
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PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry … and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher.

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
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Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition “C” will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition “C” simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City's water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”
Hetch Hetchy Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
Water Dept. Financing

PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231

NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section

6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236

NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet. Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place.

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240
NO 241

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244

NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987."

How "I" Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition "I". Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the "BIG PIE" at City Hall. Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote "YES".

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

We agree with the "PROGRESS" editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

John Moy
Former City Commissioner

Tom Spinoso
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDorses:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on "I" (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Elect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinoso for Congress, and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscans against San Franciscans. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains: Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

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

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair-thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Caspiano, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Varvara, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors°
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED°
Marie Cleasby
Eric Craven
Green Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs°
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley°
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals°
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union°
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants°
Jeff Greendorfer
Rome Guy, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation°
John Holtclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club°
Agar Jaicks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kelliherr, S.F. Tenants Union°
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow°
Margal Kaufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters°
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee°
Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel°
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance°
San Palomares-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services°
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition°
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee°
George M. Rice
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance°
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club°
Tessa Rouveral
Tom Saunders
Sun Shields
Marion Sils
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton°
Mary Vail
Dana Van Garder
Calvis Welch - Citizens for Representative Government°
Esther “B” Woode, CLU°
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance°
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landry, Democratic Women’s Forum°
°Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

°Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee°
Robert R. Boccì, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee°

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

°Morris Bernstein
William Cablentz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表 June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:  
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

转寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加上述所示之選舉。

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA- 正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申請人簽名  DATE-FECHA- 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION- 住址:
P lease mail ballot to me at:  Por favor enviéme la balota por correo:

请將選票寄給本人下址 TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente.

Descripción del Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Volante

いつも缺席選民
本人在此於舊金山市，請求永久缺席選民身份。根據選舉法典第十四二及四款的要求，我在下面說明我申請為永久缺席選民身份的原因。

說明殘障情形和性質
選民簽名
FROM:

__________________________

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?  
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN 
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,  
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984 
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA 
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO 
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA 
ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON  
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS  
155 CITY HALL  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods’ small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hong
Richard Corbatos, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pins Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Aydin, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlos Testador del Portillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Ohregon
Al Boville, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zaretta L. Goodley, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sodinma Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)

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

PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?  

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

 Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Willi McCrea
William Kuhns
Margaret Breneman
Pheobe H. Brown
Jonathan Bullock
Ellis Cohn

Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lew
Richard Livingston
Bruce Ralf

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans

Amy Meyer
Keith Eckman
Tommy Harris
Frances McAteer
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Prusseng
Tom Molloy, General Manager
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAY-GROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PRO-POSITION K.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition "K".

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city's parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let's approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It's entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let's do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco's many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote "NO" on Proposition K.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
items occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON "K"
Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, in fact encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

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 A

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter sections 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.
(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.
(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not Include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation curable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year. Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of fireman classifications in cities in said certification; (2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class; (3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and (4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strokeys, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

Not later than the 23rd of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(1) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in Monthly Labor Review or successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said index, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the public service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increments schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8,406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8,406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.

Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8,343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(2) Upon the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall be effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds herefore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled, or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6,407 (e).

7,313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

(c) Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6,401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing Hetch Hetchy water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under the commission's jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedures provided for in this charter.

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7,300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names have been submitted to him by the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the board. The secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the register of voters and to occupy the offices of register of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefore to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said office on said 8th day of January 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected; and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall determine the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission may not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48
Applicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表印在第48頁
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POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to
to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. citizen.
- are at least 18 years of age on election day.
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the
conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what
political party you consider yours, you can say “In-
dependent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this
election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County
Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and
address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back
cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting
place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you.
If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your vot-
ing place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth
even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in
voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the
ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t
know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll
workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls
on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and
  voting there
  or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’
  handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an
absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to
the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your address when you signed up to vote,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name
underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Reg-
istrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Reg-
istrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your
absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M.
on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING
CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
DEMOCRATS PLEASE NOTE:

This year the method of voting for president is different than at previous elections. Instead of voting for one presidential candidate, you will be voting for eight delegates.

Pages 1 and 2 contain the names of 48 citizens who want to be delegates at the Democratic Convention to be held here in San Francisco. Each would-be delegate is pledged to support one of the six (6) presidential candidates. The names of the presidential candidates are printed in bold letters.

(Continued on bottom of page 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</th>
<th>Vote por no más de 8 delegados</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward H. Emerson III (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td>48 delegados are listed on pages 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Santon (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td>48 delegados listados en págs. 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Monthe (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td>第1及2頁上列有48名代表，請從48名代表中投票最多8名。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen T. Dreyfus (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Mullen (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose Kent (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Kritz (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace G. Cox (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Choy Ong (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td>48 delegados are listed on pages 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Kotake (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td>48 delegados listados en págs. 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Duncan (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td>第1及2頁上列有48名代表，請從48名代表中投票最多8名。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octavious O’Neal (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Scott (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Abrahams (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie C. Anderson (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Wener (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Sklar (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegados are listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Williams (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegados listados en págs. 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Kondvils (GARY HART)</td>
<td>第1及2頁上列有48名代表，請從48名代表中投票最多8名。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Albritton (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Hunt (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hongisto (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwenn Craig (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Maher (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELEGATES**

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

**ELECCION PRIMARIA**

**DELEGATES**

**5 DE JUNIO DE 1984**

**PRIMARY ELECTION**

**JUNE 5, 1984**

**END OF PRESIDENTIAL DELEGATE LISTING**

*(Continued from bottom of page 4)*

...ters right below the would-be delegates names. Each presidential candidate has a slate of eight (8) delegates; the slates of delegates have been grouped together for your convenience.

You will probably want to cast your eight votes for the slate of 8 delegates representing the presidential candidate of your choice. If you do not want to do this, you can split your eight votes among two or more slates of delegates.

Under no circumstances should you vote for more than eight delegates (you may, however, vote for less than eight, if you wish).
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:

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

NOTA: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de 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."

C 第一步
请双手将选票插入票口，直至完全插入票口内。

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 cabezitas rojas.

C 第二步
请确认选票插入时，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 perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

C 第三步
请将选票之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

C 第四步
在投票箱内，将选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。

(Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Representative in Congress—6th District</em></td>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>State Senator — 3rd Senatorial District</em></td>
<td>Lia Belli</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Member of the Assembly — 17th Assembly District</em></td>
<td>Willie L. Brown, Jr.</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael R. Hodgkiss</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
17th DISTRICT
MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO — DISTRITO #17
民主黨縣中央委員會委員，第十七議區

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE A. MINNICK</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY MILLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MICDEN</td>
<td>Community Health Director/ Director de Salud Comunitaria</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAULA C. FISCAL</td>
<td>Legislative Specialist/Especialista Legislativa</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET L. BRADY</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultora</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINNBAUR BRADY</td>
<td>Estate Planner/Planificador de Testamentaria</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE J. DODD</td>
<td>President, S.F. N.O.W./Presidente, N.O.W. de S.F.</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/ Director de Servicios Juveniles</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BETHLE DABLE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTH GARLAND DEWSON</td>
<td>Business Woman/Mujer de Negocios</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JACKS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY VAIL</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Civil Engineer/Ingeniero Civil</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE KRAHNSER</td>
<td>Boilermaker/Calderero</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW A. KLEIN</td>
<td>Political Consultant/Consultor Politico</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for no more than 10
Voto por no mas de 10

(Contest Continued on Next Page)
VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 10
ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED
VOTE POR NO MAS DE 10 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS

(Continua en la siguiente pagina)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Position in Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>GEORGE M. RAYA</td>
<td>Public Employee/Empleado Público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>JUDY L. HUFFMAN</td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/現任委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultor/顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>MICHAEL R. HODGKISS</td>
<td>Organized Crime Fighter/Combatiente del Crimen Organizado/組織犯罪鬥士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>THEODORE M. SHANER III</td>
<td>Historian/Historiador/歷史學家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>JOHN F. CROWLEY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/現任委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>STAN CRIOLLOS</td>
<td>Community Relations Specialist/Especialista en Relaciones de la Comunidad/社區關係專家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>GWENN CRAIG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/現任委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>DOUGLAS CHAN</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado/律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/現任委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>BERNICE WONG ASTON</td>
<td>Media Consultant/Consultora de Medios de Comunicación/媒體顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILLI</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado/律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>ALBERT VETERE LANNON</td>
<td>ILWU Local President/Presidente Local de ILWU/ILWU地方主席</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Political Organizer/Organizador Político/政治活動組織人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>ADRIA GARABEDIAN</td>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizadora de la Comunidad/社區組織人</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 10 ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED
VOTE POR NO MAS DE 10 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS

5D(17)
## NONPARTISAN BALLOT

### JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

**Office Number One**  
**Vote for One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE: 無黨派選舉
JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL 地方法院法官
Oficina Número Uno 第一處
ALBERT, C. WOLLENBERG, JR Juez de la Corte Municipal
Oficina Número Uno
JUDICIAL 判決
JONATHAN McCURDY Abogado Defensor de Inquilinos
住客律師
DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES 初選

163 SI 贷或
164 NO 反对 16
ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCELES DE CONOCHO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construc- ción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárcel y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.

167 SI 贷或
168 NO 反对 17
ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.

171 SI 贷或
172 NO 反对 18
ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.

175 SI 贷或
176 NO 反对 19
ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL AMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la especificada adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.

180 SI 贷或
181 NO 反对 20
FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Desclassificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en cam- pañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún im- pacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es desclassi- cado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elec- ción adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.

一九八四年廢除懲教財政公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債$250,000,000，用作修繕、擴建、及延緩維持等費用。

一九八四年建新監獄公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債$300,000,000，用作興建、擴建、及延緩維持等費用。

一九八四年公園設施公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債$370,000,000，用作購置、發展、恢復及修復事業，以作公 園、海灘、海灘或歷史保存等用途。

一九八四年漁業與野生動植物生長及環境公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債$85,000,000，用作採 撿漁業野生動植物資源及州際保護區，作指 定的購置、擴建及發展生長及環境之用。

民選官員，凡發表醜陋性或誹謗性競選言論，因而輕微懲戒對手者，其資格予以取消，財政 影響，無直接財政影響，如一選區的候選人被 取消資格，地方政紀必須進行一次選舉以填補 空缺，則可能出現額外選舉開支。
PUBLICATION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185 ➔ NO 186 ➔

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190 ➔ NO 191 ➔

PROPERTY TAXATION, SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196 ➔ NO 197 ➔

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204 ➔ NO 205 ➔
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los hábiles de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas realizadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades. No se especifican otras comunidades. Otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos con respecto a la composición paritaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
A
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212  
NO 213  

B
Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216  
NO 217  

C
Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221  
NO 222  

E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226  
NO 227  

F
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231  
NO 232  

8E
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberá pagárseles a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hatchel para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

F. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>[ \text{YES NO} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8:**</td>
<td>16 [ 163 164 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presidential candidate&quot;)</td>
<td>17 [ 167 168 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td>18 [ 171 172 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>19 [ 175 176 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td>20 [ 180 181 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>21 [ 185 186 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td>22 [ 190 191 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>23 [ 196 197 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Committee*</td>
<td>24 [ 204 205 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>[ \text{CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A [ 212 213 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>B [ 216 217 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>C [ 221 222 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>D [ 226 227 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>E [ 231 232 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>F [ 236 237 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>G [ 240 241 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.*</td>
<td>H [ 244 245 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)</td>
<td>I [ 249 250 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Court Judge</td>
<td>J [ 253 254 ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G. ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H. ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Volantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I. ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J. ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro de los costos de encarcelamiento en un cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención, a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K. ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

JONATHAN McCURDY
My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.
My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212

NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!
Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION "A" is a vote to keep San Francisco great!
It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION "A" will keep San Francisco's best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.
Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it's harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America's best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.
Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let's hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION "A" will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn't give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco's labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city's best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco's basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by deflections to these cities.

Let's keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

PROPOSITION "A" will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION "A" would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION "A" would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION "A" would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION "A" gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.
VOTE for PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sodonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Denehein
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopf
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission

Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission

Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right.

It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club

George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club

David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee

JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party

Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club

Carole Mieden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club

Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club

Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bar- gain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It's time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church

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

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance? Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women's Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Granvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglass Hayes

Mattie Scott
Martha Simmons
Forrest Pritchett
Gloria Johnson
Matilda Whetstone
Mildred Sorrells
Ben Johnson
Betty Stoneham
Janie Reynolds
Constance Rodgers
Tommie Steele Jr.
Rhonda Darrett
Robert B. Johnson Jr.
Gregory E. Fields
Gwendolyn Thibodeaux
Juanita Francis
Albert R. Carter
Annie Y. Bradford

Anthony Wagner
Beatrice Brown
Elisa Mobley
Garnett Smith
Lenna Meacham
Madison J. Blard
Rev. Johnnie Robinson
Arthur Kellough
Mary-Ellen W. Garr
Audrey V. Jackques
Rufus Cunn
Dorothy V. Kelsoy
Anna Doll Taylor
William Bailey
Gloria Duke
Lynetta Haynes
Arthur W. Rose
Dorothy Elliott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.
It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O'Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornellius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

Sally Rot
Amor Cruz
John Garb
Bryna Ballin
Lily Tsur
Eva Tan
Germaine Uribe
Pat Hoover
Lloyd C. Jackson
Nova Bevel
Brenda Barros

Jean Pecchenino
Carolyn Davis
Laurie Smith
Mike Rijken
Margaret Kahn
Janet L. Keller, R.N.
Shnenah Silberman
Lorraine Anne Thiebaud
Evelyn Hannah
Bobbie Yancey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.
Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.
A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaick
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tess Rouseral
Ron Huberman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lida San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

Buck Bagot
Diana Jaicks
Henry Der
Susan E. Walters
Elizabeth Jewel
Betty Brooks
Paula Pede

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor 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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspoken and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won't have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor's statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can't stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let's not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

PROPONITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216

NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
Police Night Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition "B" will bring fairness and equity to the City's work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition "B" would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition "B" grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition "B". It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City's Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff's Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Proposition B to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assures that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, "night differential" certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6¾% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.). The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.”
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government. Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Max Woods
Republican State Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner
John May
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Congressional Candidate
Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committee
Stanley Bumsfeld
Republican Central Committee
Demus Mark
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee
Lisa Klohr
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committee
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman’s annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE EEMAN.
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Fi"rfighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year."

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C
BEGINNS ON PAGE 35
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry... and even other fire departments—grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial automatic pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPayers ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEeman.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPayers ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition “C” will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition “C” simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
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Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "E" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fifths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "E" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "E" would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

SECTION 6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facili-

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?  

YES 231

NO 232

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dionne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “F” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “F” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407.1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal policies of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees' Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn't be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to replace the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don't weaken our city's merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let's keep these two positions under

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240
NO 241

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Your application must be received at least one week before election day.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987."

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an Initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:
Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.
Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.
Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Commit-tee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commen-dation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liber-ate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Brammell
Republican Central Committeeman

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:
San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).


Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Francisco against San Francisco. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Francisco.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscans needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

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

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Casciato, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261
Paul Varsaceli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Steve Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Clewby
Eric Crenen
Gwenn Craig, Co-chair, National Asn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendorfer
Roma Grier, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Hollister, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jaicks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kellner, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Krofting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*
Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Palomares-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Peer, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Ray
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sai Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rowen
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sils
Arthur Simon
Peter Starn
Doris Thomas, Asst. to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch, Citizen for Representative Government*
Esther "D" Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marschall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Demet A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "I".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bacci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Palomares-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Peer, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Ray
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sai Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rowen
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sils
Arthur Simon
Peter Starn
Doris Thomas, Asst. to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch, Citizen for Representative Government*
Esther "D" Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marschall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Demet A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

- grow
- provide jobs
- raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblenz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tost
Louis Girard
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTEAUSENTE
缺席選票申請表
June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

请寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加

上列所示之選舉。

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
Prec. No.________________________
Ballot No.________________________
Ballot Mailed_______________________
Inspector's Notice___________________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

Date__________________
Deputy Registrar

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA
正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA
申請人簽名

DATE-FECHA
日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION
住址

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota
por correo:

請將選票寄給本人

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
本人在此申請成為永久缺席選民，我在此

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
本人在此申請成為永久缺席選民，我在此

Descripción del
Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante
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Impedimento/Incapacidad
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PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
本人在此申請成為永久缺席選民，我在此

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
本人在此申請成為永久缺席選民，我在此

Descripción del
Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION? (¿FIRMÓ SU APLICACIÓN?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hom
Richard Cerbatos, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carole Taixidor del Portillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Olregon
AI Borvice, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard-fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zaretti L. Goosby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sodonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARter AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249
NO 250

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Suro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47.000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRAN-
CISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-
2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS
OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL
DETENTION FACILITY.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco:

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administra-
tive Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, 
reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover 
Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as 
the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of 
monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the 
California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the 
defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, de-
velop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, 
develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the 
general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by 
a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the 
county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and com-
patible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs 
of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination 
made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed 
annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of 
incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The 
board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is neces-
sary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the 
collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California 
Penal Code.

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 K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Robert Cranner
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans

Dan Sweeney
Jack Trujillo
Jane Winfieow
Lonnie Lawson

Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hunicutt
Carol Negro
Ardon Donakas
Heide Chipp
Tim Lillyquist
Dick Greabell
John Holtzclaw

Carl Pope
Miriam Blaustein
Joyce Hall
Don Harpness
Robert Muelhbauser
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Holsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical “common sense” politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Anderson
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Fairo
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bysiek
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants’ Association
Garr Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feese
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Kath Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on “K”.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

 Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

lems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor

Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

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 A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.
(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.
(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this chapter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall in-clude the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation.”

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the fire department of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, jumpers, firemen, hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c), (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a), (2) and (3) and (c), (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for unforfirmed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

7.313 Hatch Hetchy Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hatch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hatch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.
(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hatch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.
(c) Hatch Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing Hatch Hetchy water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under the commission's jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fifths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (d) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

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

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the office of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary thereafter to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint his executive assistant who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to

PROPOSITION K, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1987, shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1984 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o’clock noon, on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975 thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o’clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing the construction of structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48

Application para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
  ● are a U.S. citizen.
  ● are at least 18 years of age on election day.
  ● are a resident of California, and
  ● are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  ● Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
  ● mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  ● your address when you signed up to vote,
  ● the address where you want the ballot mailed,
  ● then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
### PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

#### DELEGATES

| 48 delegates are listed on pages 1 & 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates. |
|---|---|---|
| 48 delegados listados en páginas 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Lantz (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn K. Lantz (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. Kilber (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Kilber (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael R. Hodgkins (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy L. Huffman (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew A. Klein (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Kevonizer Ingraham (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Weinsberg (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest A. Bates (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herma Hill Kay (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry A. Francois (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadie Redd (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy L. Larson (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Lin (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Walter (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris M. Ward (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Roselli (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Blake (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J. Twomey (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Post (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Trouille (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Miesly (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Jean Dodd (WALTER MONDALE)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELEGATE LISTING CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

---

**DEMOCRATS PLEASE NOTE:**

This year the method of voting for president is different than at previous elections. Instead of voting for one presidential candidate, you will be voting for eight delegates.

Pages 1 and 2 contain the names of 48 citizens who want to be delegates at the Democratic Convention to be held here in San Francisco. Each would-be delegate is pledged to support one of the six (6) presidential candidates. The names of the presidential candidates are printed in bold let-

(Continued on bottom of page 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</th>
<th>Vote por no mas de 8 delegados</th>
<th>48 delegates are listed on pages 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55. Donna Lee Horn (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td>55. Donna Lee Horn (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed en pagas. 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. H. Jackson Zinn (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td>60. H. Jackson Zinn (GEORGE MCGOVERN)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed en pagas. 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Amos C. Brown (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td>64. Amos C. Brown (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed en pagas. 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Harry Britten (GARY HART)</td>
<td>71. Harry Britten (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Rebecca Varner (GARY HART)</td>
<td>72. Rebecca Varner (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. John Holtzclaw (GARY HART)</td>
<td>73. John Holtzclaw (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Doris Thomas (GARY HART)</td>
<td>74. Doris Thomas (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Clifford Lee (GARY HART)</td>
<td>75. Clifford Lee (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Constance O'Connor (GARY HART)</td>
<td>76. Constance O'Connor (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Jon Henry Koub (GARY HART)</td>
<td>77. Jon Henry Koub (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Barbara Totrell (GARY HART)</td>
<td>78. Barbara Totrell (GARY HART)</td>
<td>48 delegates listed on page 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

...ters right below the would-be delegates names. Each presidential candidate has a slate of eight (8) delegates; the slates of delegates have been grouped together for your convenience.

You will probably want to cast your eight votes for the slate of 8 delegates representing the presidential candidate of your choice. If you do not want to do this, you can split your eight votes among two or more slates of delegates.

Under no circumstances should you vote for more than eight delegates (you may, however, vote for less than eight, if you wish).
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."

A 第一步

請雙手持票向自動機裡整張選票插入。

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.

C 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.

D 第三步

請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。

(Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.)
### Representative in Congress — 5th District
**EVELYN K. LANTZ**
- Consultant
- Diputada al Congreso — Distrito #5

**SALA BURTON**
- Diputada al Congreso, 5th District
- 第五區國會眾議員

### State Senator — 3rd Senatorial District
**LIA BELLI**
- Trade Negotiator/Conservationist
- Negociador de Comercio/Abogada Por La Conservación

**JUDY L. HUFFMAN**
- Businesswoman
- Mujer de Negocios

### Member of the Assembly — 17th Assembly District
**WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.**
- Speaker, California Assembly
- Orador, Asamblea de California

**MICHAEL R. HODGKISS**
- Political Action Committeeman
- Miembro Comité de Acción Política
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE A. MINNICK</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLIN MILLER</td>
<td>Board Member, Wallenberg/Miembro de Junta, Wallenberg/</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIDGET</td>
<td>Community Health Director/Director de Salud Comunitaria/</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAULA C. FISCHL</td>
<td>Legislative Specialist/Especialista Legislativa/</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET L. BRADY</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultora</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINNBARR BRADY</td>
<td>Estate Planner/Planificador de Testamentaria/</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE J. DODD</td>
<td>President, N.O.W./Presidente, N.O.W. de S.F./</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios Juveniles/</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DAILY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTH GARLAND DEWSON</td>
<td>Business Woman/Mujer de Negocios/</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JACIKS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY VAIL</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Civil Engineer/Ingeniero Civil/</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE KRASSNER</td>
<td>Boilermaker/Calderero</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW A. KLEIN</td>
<td>Political Consultant/Consultor Politico/</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>GEORGE M. RAYA</td>
<td>Public Employee/Empleado Público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>JUDY L. HUFFMAN</td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>MICHAEL R. HODGKISS</td>
<td>Organized Crime Fighter/Combatiente del Crimen Organizado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>THEODORE M. SHANER III</td>
<td>Historian/Historiador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>JOHN F. CROWLEY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>STAN CRIOLOIS</td>
<td>Community Relations Specialist/Especialista en Relaciones de la Comunidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>GWENN CRAIG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>DOUGLAS CHAN</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>BERNICE WONG ASTON</td>
<td>Media Consultant/Consultor de Medios de Comunicación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILL</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>ALBERT VETERE LANNON</td>
<td>ILWU Local President/Presidente Local de ILWU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Political Organizer/Organizador Político</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>ADRIA GARABEDIAN</td>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizadora de la Comunidad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 10 ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED**

**VOTE POR NO MAS DE 10 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS**
### JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Number One</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES</td>
<td>PROPUSICIONES ESTATUALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>163 SI 買成</strong></td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCELLES DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárceliles de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>164 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年建築新監獄公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債 $250,000,000, 用作興建、重建、改建和翻新監獄，以及維持維持等費用。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>167 SI 買成</strong></td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>168 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年建築新監獄公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債 $300,000,000, 用作興建、重建、裝修、以及維持維持等費用。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>171 SI 買成</strong></td>
<td>ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>172 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年加州公園及康樂設施法案。這個法案規定發行公債 $370,000,000, 以便進行指定的購買、發展、恢復及修復實業，以作公園、海灘、康樂或歷史保存等用途。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>175 SI 買成</strong></td>
<td>ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la especificada adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>176 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年保護野生動物及生態環境法案。這個法案規定發行公債 $85,000,000, 用作撥款給野生動物保護局及州海岸保護局，作指定的購置、改進及發展生態環境之用。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>FUNKIONÁRIO ELEGIDO.</strong> Desclasificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es desclasificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>180 SI 買成</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年候選人選舉言論法案。這個法案規定候選人選舉言論，因誹謗性或誹謗性選舉言論，將對候選人及選民造成不公平影響，因而五個候選人被取消資格，地方政府如必須進行一次選舉以填補空缺，則可能需負額外選舉開支。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>181 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年候選人選舉言論法案。這個法案規定候選人選舉言論，因誹謗性或誹謗性選舉言論，將對候選人及選民造成不公平影響，因而五個候選人被取消資格，地方政府如必須進行一次選舉以填補空缺，則可能需負額外選舉開支。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS.</strong></td>
<td>Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>YES 185</td>
<td>NO 186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS.</strong></td>
<td>Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>YES 190</td>
<td>NO 191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION.</strong></td>
<td>Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>YES 196</td>
<td>NO 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING.</strong></td>
<td>Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>YES 204</td>
<td>NO 205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Específica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependerá de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de directores del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavaluo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de rendimientos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de evaluación. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de rendimientos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades federales de las comunidades y posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de rendimientos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los rendimientos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición particular de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serán reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

**A**

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

**B**

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/4% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/4%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

**C**

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

**E**

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

**F**
A: Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B: Deberá pagarseles a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C: Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D: Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E: Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
## NONPARTISAN BALLOT

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

_____________________________________________________

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POOLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.**</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presential candidate)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Congress Representative</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Senator</strong> (if applicable)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Assembly</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Committee</strong>*</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)

**Muni Court Judge**

1. ______________________

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won't be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don't vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:
“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential—fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right.

In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services—services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hard-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

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

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION "A" will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn't give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco's labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city's best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco's basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let's keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION "A" will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION "A" would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION "A" would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION "A" would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION "A" gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sedonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbono
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Denhein
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kofy
Member, Board of Education

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits.

Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren DeMerritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits.

Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Leeman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Johnnie Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
SalRosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reddy
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it's fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION "A". A YES vote on PROPOSITION "A" will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Jack Creighton
Visitacion Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Paulsen
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philhower
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udovich
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bar-

gain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A:

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women's Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O'Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornelia Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaucks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tess Rouveral
Ron Haberman

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

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Filippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON Proposition A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of govern-

ment, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor 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.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970’s, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspoken and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. New, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business

of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

**PROPOSITION B**

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

- **YES** 216
- **NO** 217

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

**A YES VOTE MEANS** that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

**A NO VOTE MEANS** that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “B”**

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, Quemin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, and Nancy Walker.

**NO:** Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “B”**

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year."

---

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59**

**Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early**

Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
Police Night Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 1/4% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the "high crime" evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city's Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaske Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

"Night Differential" is as basic as "apple pie."

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe...
Police Night Pay

that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.
I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Max Woods
Republican State Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner
John Moy
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Congressional Candidate
Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committee
Stanley Braunwell
Republican Central Committee
Dennis Mark
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee
Lisa Klobucar
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committee
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police

Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE.

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

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive $2.5\%$ additional compensation, after fifteen years service $5\%$ and after twenty years service $7.5\%$, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221
NO 222

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- $2.5\%$ over base pay after 10 years of service,
- $5\%$ over base pay after 15 years of service,
- $7.5\%$ over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry … and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced firefighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial increases again in July!

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition “C” will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition “C” simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

**PROPOSITION E**

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “E”**

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, and Nancy Walker.

None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

---

**Controller’s Statement on “E”**

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

---

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37**
Hetch Hetchy Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "E" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "E" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City's General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy's facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "E" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231 ∆  
NO  232 ∆

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F"

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “F” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “F” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “F”.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!
San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to ap-
prove or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.
Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section

6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities: (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of

(Continued on page 62)

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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Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>236</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to replace the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place.

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

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

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Your application must be received at least one week before election day.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?  

YES 244

NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committeeman on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

Former City Commissioner

John Moy
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Brumwell
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).


Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscans against San Franciscans. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
C. Al, Causino, President, S.F. Police Officers' Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dep't. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Conning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleary
Eric Crenen
Gwenyth Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs. *
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gal, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greenfelder
Rona Gay, Co-Director, Women's Foundation*
John Holzclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jacks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kellibler, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Kretting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Palomares-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Poit, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Raya
Jean Rosi, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Rovella, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rouxler
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thoman, Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "B" Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Atienore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women's Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "I".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocchi, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O'Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Malyfne A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City's finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

- grow
- provide jobs
- raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Cohien
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city's best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

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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Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods’ small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Horowitz, Commissioner, Board of Education
Richard Corbatos, Commissioner, Board of Education
Delis Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yuri Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which affect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carloita Tezider del Portillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Ohregon
Al Bower, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Superintendent Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zurett L. Goosby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sedona Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven-nine members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
Jail Cost Reimbursement

PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

Yes 249
No 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can't be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It's only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they're convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253 ▶
NO 254 ▶

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

Amy Meyer
Keith Eckman
Tommy Harris
Frances McAteer
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Yrungas
Tom Malloy, General Manager

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Robert Cramer Rev. Henry Davis Robert Duira Rebecca Evans
Amy Meyer Keith Eckman Tommy Harris Frances McAteer Jeffrey K. Mori G. Samantha Yrungas

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Nero
Walter Park
Veronica Hunicutt
Carol Negro
Arden Duanekat
Heide Chipp
Tom Lillobrust
Dick Gravsholt
John Holzclaw

Carl Pope
Miriam Blaustein
Joyce Hall
Doe Hanutz
Robert Mucklinbauer
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Holzleder
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile  
Executive Director  
North of Market Senior Service Center  
Poul E. Andersen  
Manager  
Mark Twain Hotel  
Sarah Kearney  
Richard Livingston  
Past Presidents  
North of Market Planning Coalition  
John Fitzgerald  
Administrator  
St. Boniface Church  
Flora Harvey  
Secretary  
Cadillac Tenants Association  
Leroy Looper  
Executive Director  
Reality House West  
Randy Shaw  
Executive Director  
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Eighth Street Tenants Association  
Executive Director  
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association  
Rob Waters  
Editor  
Tenderloin Times  
Barbara Byrnes  
Executive Director  
Hospitality House  
Richard Parker  
Chairman  
William Penn Tenants' Association  
Garth Ferguson  
President  
The Homeless Caucus  
Marvin J. Phillips  
Vice Chairman  
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee  
Don Feuer  
President  
North of Market Planning Coalition  
Catherine A. Merschel  
Executive Director  
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation  
Nancy L. Hampton  
Secretary  
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth  
Sue Hestor  
Brad Paul  
Ruth Gravanis  
David Jones  
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

Problems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON "K"

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let's do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco's architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning's Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California's School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university's simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan's sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan's innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children's playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is "supposed" to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

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 A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, and 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this subsection. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(i) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(l) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnings” as used in section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco.
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8,361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may regard any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in said cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between service steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8,540.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8,361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the department of inspectors of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-
month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Con-
sumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of in-
crease or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown
by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the cer-
tified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to
herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor
Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor pub-
llication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the
compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors
shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact
finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods
therebefore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of liv-
ing adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percen-
tage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in ad-
to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same
time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of
compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average
cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the
civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San
Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such
cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase would be
granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with
the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of Sep-
tember of said year by representatives of the unified members of the
police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commis-
sions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to
the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding
citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by
a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living in-
crease shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.
(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no
unified member of the police or fire department employed prior to July
1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained
herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new com-
pen- sation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue
until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary in-
crement schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be ex-
tended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition
against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be
deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.
(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no
unified member of the police or fire department, whose compensation
is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary re-
duction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for
herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of
compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to super-
cede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the forgoing sub-sec-
tions, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory ser-
vice shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.
Service shall not qualify as “satisfactory” if the member has been sus-
spended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately pre-
ceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for
herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise dis-
ciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be
entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by
the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.
Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for
purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions pro-
vided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for addi-
tional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the
effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and
allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen
years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the
rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be
paid;
(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty
years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this sec-
ction shall be paid;
(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an
amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as de-
efined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the
manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.
Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein pro-
vided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period im-
mediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of ser-
vice.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board
of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall
have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of
acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water
uses and water power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under
such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by ap-
propriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accor-
dance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including
amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Re-
venue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive,
of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of
such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate
of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by
the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of
the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained
in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commis-
sion pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor
evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute
and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable sol-
ely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch
Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or con-
trolled by it.

(c) Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pur-
suant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit
provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the
city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the
purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or de-
veloping Hetch Hetchy water facilities or water power facilities under the
commission’s jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided
for in this charter.

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be sub-
ject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section
7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue
bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities,
when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmati-
ave vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereafter or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the office of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefor to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1984, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 6th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January, 1981.

The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years, the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Therefore, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected; and at the general election in 1986, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall approve the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have no adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48
Application para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
  • are a U.S. citizen.
  • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
  • are a resident of California, and
  • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
  • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  • your address when you signed up to vote,
  • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
  • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
## 48 delegates are listed on pages 1 & 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.

### Democratic Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Lantz</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn K. Lantz</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. Kilber</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Kilber</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael R. Hodgkiss</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy L. Huffman</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew A. Klein</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Konviser Ingraham</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Presidential Candidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Weissberg</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest A. Bates</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herma Hill Kay</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry A. Francois</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadie Redi</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy L. Larson</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Lin</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Walter</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doris M. Ward</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Rosselli</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Blake</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J. Twomey</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Post</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Trujillo</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Migden</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Jean Dodd</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delegate Listing Continued on Next Page

---

**Democrats Please Note:**

This year the method of voting for president is different than at previous elections. Instead of voting for one presidential candidate, you will be voting for eight delegates.

Pages 1 and 2 contain the names of 48 citizens who want to be delegates at the Democratic Convention to be held here in San Francisco. Each would-be delegate is pledged to support one of the six (6) presidential candidates. The names of the presidential candidates are printed in bold let-

(Continued on bottom of page 5)
### Vote for no more than 8 delegates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Delegate Name</th>
<th>Delegate Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Donna Lee Horn (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Paul H. Melbostad (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Katherine G. Flynn (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Robert Swingley (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Janis Alvarado (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>H. Jackson Zinn (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Gaal Sapiro (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Craig W. Campbell (GEORGE McGOVERN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Howard Gloyd (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Amos C. Brown (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mabel Sikmei Teng (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>George M. Raya (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Marie Parks (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Ben Madrid (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>A. Billy S. Jones (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Julianne Malveaux (JESSE JACKSON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Harry Britt (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Rebecca Varner (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>John Holtzclaw (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Doris Thomas (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Clifford Lee (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Constance O'Connor (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Jon Henry Kouha (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Barbara Torell (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 48 delegates are listed on pages 1 & 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.

### 48 delegados listados en págs. 1-2. Votar por 8 delegados solamente.

You will probably want to cast your eight votes for the slate of 8 delegates representing the presidential candidate of your choice. If you do not want to do this, you can split your eight votes among two or more slates of delegates.

Under no circumstances should you vote for more than eight delegates (you may, however, vote for less than eight, if you wish).
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.

Usage de los dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双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 coincidan con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
请如把选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perfore con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
请把票袋之选票插入，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

第四步
投票选举之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格预备为投票人填写。

(Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress—5th</td>
<td>EVELYN K. LANTZ</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultanta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTION PRIMARIA</td>
<td>(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1964</td>
<td>SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No existe contienda para el puesto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>de Senador Estatal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>本區沒有州參議員選舉。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly —</td>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th Assembly District</td>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orador, Asamblea de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL R. HODGKISS</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Action Committeeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro Comité de Acción Política</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE**
**17th DISTRICT**
**MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO — DISTRITO #17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE A. MINNICK</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARILYN MILLER</td>
<td>Board Member, Wallenberg/Miembro de Junta, Wallenberg</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Community Health Director/Director de Salud Comunitaria</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAULA C. FISCAL</td>
<td>Legislative Specialist/Especialista Legislativa</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET L. BRADY</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultora</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINNBARR BRADY</td>
<td>Estate Planner/Planificador de Testamentaria</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE J. DODD</td>
<td>President, S.F. N.O.W./Presidente, N.O.W. de S.F.</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Youth Services Director/Director de Servicios Juveniles</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTH GARLAND DEWSON</td>
<td>Business Woman/Mujer de Negocios</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JACKS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY VAIL</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Civil Engineer/Ingeniero Civil</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE KRASSNER</td>
<td>Boilermaker/Calderero</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW A. KLEIN</td>
<td>Political Consultant/Consultor Politico</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vote for no more than 10*

**Vote por no mas de 10**

---

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

**ELECTION PRIMARIA**

**COMITE DEL CONDADO**

**COUNTY COMMITTEE**

**PRIMARY ELECTION**

**JUNE 5, 1964**

---

*(Contest Continued on Next Page)*

**VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN 10**

**ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED**

**VOTE POR NO MAS DE 10 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS**

*(Continua en la siguiente pagina)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>GEORGE M. RAYA</td>
<td>Public Employee/Empleado Público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>JUDY L. HUFFMAN</td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>TERRY HUGUININ</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultor/顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>MICHAEL R. HODGKISS</td>
<td>Organized Crime Fighter/Combatiendo del Crimen Organizado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>THEODORE M. SHANER III</td>
<td>Historian/Historiador/歷史學家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>JOHN F. CROWLEY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>STAN CRIOLLOS</td>
<td>Community Relations Specialist/Especialista en Relaciones de la Comunidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>GWENN CRAIG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>DOUGLAS CHAN</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado/律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>BERNICE WONG ASTON</td>
<td>Media Consultant/Consultora de Medios de Comunicación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>KENNETH JOHN AZBILL</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado/律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>ALBERT VETERE LANNON</td>
<td>ILWU Local President/Presidente Local de ILWU/ILWU地區分支主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Political Organizer/Organizador Político/政治活動組織人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>ADRIAN GARABEDIAN</td>
<td>Community Organizer/Organizadora de la Comunidad/社區組織人</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR
Judge of Municipal Court

JONATHAN McCURDY
Tenant Attorney

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

16 COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.

YES 163
NO 164

17 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.

YES 167
NO 168

18 CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.

YES 171
NO 172

19 FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.

YES 175
NO 176

ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.

YES 180
NO 181
### DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Nota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CERCES DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cérceres de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
<td>一九八四年發債補建荒地法案。這個法案規定發行公債$250,000,000，用作興建、重建、改建和維持等費用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY Abogado Defensor de Inquietos</td>
<td>住客律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
<td>一九八四年建監監獄公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債$300,000,000，用作興建、重建、裝修、以及維持等費用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
<td>一九八四年加州公園及設施設施法案。這個法案規定發行公債$370,000,000，用作指定的購買、發展、恢復及設施設施，以作公園、商場、娛樂或歷史保存等用途。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la especificada adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
<td>一九八四年魚類與野生動物生長地帶擴建法案。這個法案規定發行公債$85,000,000，用作撥款供野生動物保護局及州海岸保護局，作指定的購買、擴建及發展生長地帶之用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campanas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrán incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
<td>民選官員，凡發表誣衊或造謗性競選言論，因而擊敗競選對手者，可資予以取消。財政影響：無直接財政影響。如獲勝的候選人被取消資格，地方政府如必須進行二次選舉以補闕空缺，則可要求資補額外選舉開支。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES  185  NO  186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES  190  NO  191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES  196  NO  197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES  204  NO  205
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE 無政黨選票

INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS. Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara las haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Específica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUBLIC PENSION INVESTMENT. Modifies provisions for investment. Declares the pension funds as fiduciary funds. Specifies the investment norms for the fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. An indirect effect could result from the flexibility additional to the selection of the personal account held in the program of investments.

PUETOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL. Exempts from the civil service a specific director of the State School of Public Employment and the State School of Schoolmasters. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. An indirect effect may result from the flexibility additional to the selection of the personal account held in the program of investments.

State service exemptions. Exempts specific directors of civil service from public duty. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. An indirect effect may result from the flexibility additional to the selection of the personal account held in the program of investments.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. Exempts from the real estate tax the construction for security against earthquakes. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. An indirect effect may result from the flexibility additional to the selection of the personal account held in the program of investments.

PROPERTY TAX. Exempts from the real estate tax construction for security against earthquakes. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. An indirect effect may result from the flexibility additional to the selection of the personal account held in the program of investments.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición y votación de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Fiscal impact: The funds for the sostenimiento of the Legislature of 1984-85 would be reduced by 878,000 of the amount that must be otherwise distributed. From the 1984-85, a limit set to the consolidation for the Legislature.

STATE CONSTRUCTION FOR EARTHQUAKE SECURITY. Exempts from the real estate tax construction for security against earthquakes. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. An indirect effect may result from the flexibility additional to the selection of the personal account held in the program of investments.

LEGISLATION: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, CONSOLIDATION. Specifies the proceeding respecting the composition and voting of the committees, of the requirements to vote, and of other matters. Reduces the allocations for support. Fiscal impact: The funds for the support of the Legislature of 1984-85 would be reduced by 878,000 of the amount that must be otherwise distributed. From the 1984-85, a limit set to the consolidation for the Legislature.
## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

### A
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

- **YES 212**
- **NO 213**

### B
Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

- **YES 216**
- **NO 217**

### C
Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

- **YES 221**
- **NO 222**

### E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

- **YES 226**
- **NO 227**

### F
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

- **YES 231**
- **NO 232**
¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

A

¿Deberá pagárselo a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

B

¿Deberá los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetch, para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984
TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STATE PROPPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.**</td>
<td>YES 163 NO 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presenial candidate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Committee*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversor Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debe ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votoles, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debe la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiar a años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro de los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

### RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212

NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!
Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance.

This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sondita Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerfatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Dennehein
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Koop
Member, Board of Education

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

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Loannen
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Tolkas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result. Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.
San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.
San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.
Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.
Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.
Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church

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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?
Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.
All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.
A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.
San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.
Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.
Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaymes
Granville A. Jackson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.
It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.
Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O’Brien

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.
A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaicks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

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

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly-Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposilion “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of govern-

ment, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor 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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecific and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won't have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors' ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-wage compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor's statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can't stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let's not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

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

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
Police Night Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES" vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential" certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

YES ON PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 1/2% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.). The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Million Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.”
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco.
Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Cusciauto, President
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvretti
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Max Woods
Republican State Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Tyrone Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner
John May
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Congressional Candidate
Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committee
Shirley Brumwell
Republican Central Committee
Dennis Mark
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee
Lita Klobucar
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committee
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O'Keefe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE.
Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221

NO 222

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:

- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmett Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.

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

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don't clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco's firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the "problem" alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification, the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City's water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
Hetch Hetchy Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
Water Dept. Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “F” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “F” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section

6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240

NO 241

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

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

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder's duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder's Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.
Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.
Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate
George Rehnert
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committeeman on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate
Robert Guichard
Businessman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner
John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Stanley Brunwell
Republican Central Committeeman
Tan Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate
Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunist is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. A. Cusick, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Cilla Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Varnell, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Woman’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walker L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Mothers
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Barats, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Cunningham, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleshey
Eric Crowen
Gwenne Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.
Souha Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engsman, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Fay, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gele, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greenfield
Romia Gay, Co-Director, Women's Foundation*
John Holcomb, Chn., S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jaucks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Killian, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margie Kaufman
Steven M. Kretting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Palemara-Cristol
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Reyes
Jean Ruiz, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rowover
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Mdm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dona Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "B" Woeste, CLU*
Folly Mushull, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women's Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representa-
tive of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "I".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O'Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Madeline E. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Commit-
tee*
Umaid W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representa-
tive government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with ele-
ven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City's finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city's best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representa-
tive and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I
would throw our city government into turmoil.

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Cottentz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraud
Henry Berman
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:

Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at:

Mailing address, if different from above

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Horo
Richard Cerbates, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Lourry Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tam, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jenn Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which affect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carla Turner del Piero, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Olvera
Al Borvick, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wesman Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zuretti L. Goodman, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Broocks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sadie Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I. The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249
NO 250

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.

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

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: "Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time."

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PREFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition "K".

Support Proposition "K".

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition "J" to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public's right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition "K". Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION K!

A "YES" vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City's green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

San Francisco's Recreation and Park facilities are the "lungs" of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON "K"

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY'S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Willinda McCrea
William Kuhns
Margaret Brennan
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Bulkeley
Ellen Cohn

Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jonnie Lew
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rajful

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans

San Francisco's Recreation and Park facilities are the "lungs" of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hinnickatt
Carol Negro
Arden Danekas
Hede Chipp
Tim Lillygut
Dick Grossboll
John Holtzclaw

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Carl Pope
Miriam Blustein
Joyce Hall
Don Horanzy
Robert Muchlbauser
Stanley J. Herstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kourney
Richard Livingston
Past President
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tarro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bysiek
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants' Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feese
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K.”
Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have maximum light. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-

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

Problems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON "K"

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco's architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning's Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California's School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university's simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan's sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let's do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kop

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The Downtown Plan's innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children's playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is "supposed" to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

8.541 Police Department

(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor and shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgment of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half which is herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations thereafter shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”. Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct.

The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall in-clude the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or shift split, or pay for special services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over, of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in such instance, the public utility commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall constitute evidence of indebtedness of the city and county but shall not be considered to evidence any indebtedness of the special assessment district created under the laws of the state.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (c).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition
The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary
The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the discretion of the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affiliations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.
The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief ad-

ministrative officer, to prescribe general rules and regulations for the administrative service under his control; to have a voice but no vote in the board of supervisors, with the right to report on or to discuss any matter before the said board concerning the affairs of the departments in his charge; to make such recommendations and propose such measures to the mayor, the board of supervisors, or committees thereof, concerning the affairs of the city and county in his charge as he may deem necessary; to coordinate the functioning of the several departments of the city and county charged with powers and duties relating to control of traffic; and to provide for the budgeting and control of publicity and advertising expenditures of the city and county.
The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six persons receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years, the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year thereafter, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year thereafter, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected:

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o’clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o’clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, “property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission” shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48

Application para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to
vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. citizen.
• are at least 18 years of age on election day.
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the
conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what
political party you consider yours, you can say “Inde-
pendent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to
vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this
election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County
Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and
address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back
cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting
place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you.
If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your vot-
ing place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth
even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in
voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the
ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t
know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll
workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there anyway to vote besides going to the polls
on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and
  voting there
or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’
handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an
absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to
the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your address when you signed up to vote,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name
underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Reg-
istrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Reg-
istrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your
absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M.
on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING
CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
### DEMOCRATS PLEASE NOTE:

This year the method of voting for president is different than at previous elections. Instead of voting for one presidential candidate, you will be voting for eight delegates. Pages 1 and 2 contain the names of 48 citizens who want to be delegates at the Democratic Convention to be held here in San Francisco. Each would-be delegate is pledged to support one of the six (6) presidential candidates. The names of the presidential candidates are printed in bold letters.

(Continued on bottom of page 5)
## Vote for no more than 8 delegates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegate</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Delegates Listed on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Harry Britt (GARY HART)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rebecca Varner (GARY HART)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>John Holtzclaw (GARY HART)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Doris Thomas (GARY HART)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Clifford Lee (GARY HART)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Constance O'Connor (GARY HART)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Jon Henry Kouba (GARY HART)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Barbara Torel (GARY HART)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Brian Lantz (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Evelyn K. Lantz (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>David L. Kilber (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Susan E. Kilber (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Michael R. Hodgkinson (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Judy L. Huffman (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Andrew A. Klein (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Andrea Konviser Ingraham (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Lawrence Weissberg (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ernest A. Bates (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Herma Hill Kay (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Terry A. Francois (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Hadie Redd (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Nancy L. Larson (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Kim Lin (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Vivian Walter (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td>pages 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

You will probably want to cast your eight votes for the slate of 8 delegates representing the presidential candidate of your choice. If you do not want to do this, you can split your eight votes among two or more slates of delegates.

Under no circumstances should you vote for more than eight delegates (you may, however, vote for less than eight, if you wish).
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."

第三步
请双手持票向自动机内票位置票插入。

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 cabezucas rojas.

第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，按合于二红针之上。

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
请将票之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4
After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

第四步
投票选票之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾插入在外。

在封袋上，有空白者预设为投票人用。

(Due to space limitations and requirements that the other sample ballot pages face each other, the voting instructions had to be placed in the middle of your sample ballot. When you go to the polls this page on your voting machine will be blank.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress—5th District</td>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVELYN K. LANTZ</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator — 3rd Senatorial District</td>
<td>LIA BELLI</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUDY L. HUFFMAN</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly — 19th Assembly District</td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19th District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO — DISTRITO #19</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民主黨縣區中央委員會委員，第十九議區</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Fraijo</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally B. Famarin</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Fazio</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Burton</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan M. Twomey</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D. Ingraham</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Konviser Ingraham</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Kilber</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for no more than 4
Vote por no mas de 4

(Contest Continued on Next Page)

VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN FOUR
ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED
VOTE POR NO MAS DE 4 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS

(Continua en la siguiente pagina)

兩頁總共最多限選四人
(下頁尚有競選人名單)
## MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
**19th DISTRICT**

**MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO — DISTRITO #19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>SUSAN KELLY KENNEDY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>现任委员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>JOSEPH M. HURLEY</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>劳工關係</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relaciones Laborales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>现任委员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>ALEXA SMITH</td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate</td>
<td>税改改革倡議人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partidaria de la Reforma en Impuestos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>Director, Board Equalization</td>
<td>平等局主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Junta de Compensación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>DAVID LOOMAN</td>
<td>Labor Relations Consultant</td>
<td>劳工關係顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor en Relaciones Laborales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>GODFREY DAVIDSBURG LEHMAN</td>
<td>Writer — Advertising Exec.</td>
<td>作家 — 廣告部行政人員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escritor — Ejecutivo en Publicidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>现任委员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN FOUR ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED**

**VOTE POR NO MAS DE 4 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS**

民主黨, 縣區中央委員會委員, 第十九議區

民主黨 — 1984年6月5日
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>163 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCEL DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárcel de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>164 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年頭號監獄建議發行公債法案，這個法案規定發行公債$250,000,000，用作興建，重建，改建和更換新監獄，以及額外維持等費用。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>167 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>168 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年建築新監獄公債法案，這個提案規定發行公債$300,000,000，用作興建，重建，裝修，以及額外維持等費用。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>171 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td>ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>172 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年加州公園及康樂設施法案，這個法案規定發行公債$370,000,000，以便進行指定的購置，發展，恢復及修復實業，以作公園，海灘，康樂或歷史保存等用途。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>175 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td>ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>176 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>一九八四年魚類與野生動物成長地帶改革法案，這個法案規定發行公債$85,000,000，用作撥款給野生動物保護局及州海岸局，作指定之購買、改進及發展生態地帶之用。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>180 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td>FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Descalificacion cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrán incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>181 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td>民選官員，凡發表造謠性或造謠性競選言論，因而敗選競選對手者，其資格予以取消，財政影響，無直接財政影響。如一政競選者被取消資格，地方政府可必須進行二次選舉以填補空缺，則可蒙需負額外選舉開支。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los hábiles de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Específicas las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependerá de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SIEMPOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sísmos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades bienal de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1994-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1994-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

州議會，規則，程序，權力，撥款。制訂各委員會中各黨組成的程序，投票規定和其他事項。削减後勤經費撥款。財政影響：州議會經費開支將較一九八五至八五財政年度規定的撥款減少 $37,000,000。一九八五至八五財政年度後，州議會經費的增長將比出一最高限額。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2¼% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7¼%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgar en el 2022 a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los que son provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

212 SI Acuerdo

213 NO Enmende

¿Deberá pagarse a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

216 SI Acuerdo

217 NO Enmende

¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2.125% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7.125%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

221 SI Acuerdo

222 NO Enmende

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

226 SI Acuerdo

227 NO Enmende

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

231 SI Acuerdo

232 NO Enmende
Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?  
**YES 236**  
**NO 237**

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?  
**YES 240**  
**NO 241**

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?  
**YES 244**  
**NO 245**

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?  
**YES 249**  
**NO 250**

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?  
**YES 253**  
**NO 254**
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

__________________________________________________________

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

## CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>1 or 8.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presidential candidate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Congress Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Committee*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muni Court Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>163 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>167 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>171 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>175 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>180 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>185 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>190 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>196 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>204 205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>212 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>216 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>221 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>226 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>231 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>236 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>240 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>249 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>253 254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1964 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1966, y deberán cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedad del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY
My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.
My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies? YES 212  NO 213

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Remne.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let's make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".
Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco's growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION "A", we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION "A", our loss will be these cities' and counties' gain.

Take stock in San Francisco's future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers' money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!
It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.
A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.
Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.
Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.
Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.
Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.
Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.
PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION "A" will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn't give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco's labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city's best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco's basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let's keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION "A" will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION "A" would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION "A" would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION "A" would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION "A" gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.
VOTE for PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Ken Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sadonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Denebein
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education

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

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission

Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission

Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Ruol Wallenberg Democratic Club

George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club

David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee member

JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party

Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club

Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club

Sal Rosselli, President

Alice B. Tolkas Democratic Club

Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits. Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it's good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitation Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Pacheco
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philibosian
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udoch
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposal A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposal A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglass Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposal A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O’Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaacks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tess Roversal
Ron Huberman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Seved
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

Back Bogot
Diana Jaicks
Henry Der
Susan E. Walters
Elizabeth Jewel
Betty Brooks
Paula Pede

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor's statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can't stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

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

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6/4% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential is one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.” Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

Dennis Mark
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate

Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committeeman
Stanley Braunwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate
Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate
Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committeeman
Lisa Kloheucr
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committeeman
Patricia Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman
JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeeweoman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEEMAN.
Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:

- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.40S Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification; (2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class; (3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and (4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Fariell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F". Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities. Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars. Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars. It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Water Department Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:
“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application
is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.
Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240

NO 241

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

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

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder's duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government. The Recorder's office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder's Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder's job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It's like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City's elections office. It is in the best interest of a well-run city that the Recorder's office be carefully, independently administered on a full-time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate "red tape", delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions. Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

State Assembly Candidate

George Rutrem
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Commit-tee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman

State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

Former City Commissioner

John Moy
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Eelect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinosa for Congress,

and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pit- ted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrup-ted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors pro-vides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — governance that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. A. Carcione, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261
Paul Varticelli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardi, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleary
Eric Craven
Gwenn Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engemann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Galv, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendraper
Roma Gay, Co-Director, Women's Foundation*
John Holtzclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jaicks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kelliker, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Palomares-Criollos
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George R. Raya
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rouwrool
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch: Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "J" Woester, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lorus O'Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Maudline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bleyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

- grow
- provide jobs
- raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Cohleantz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giaundo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

缺席選票申請表

June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:

Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參
加上述所示之選舉。

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
Prep. No.____________________
Ballot No.____________________
Ballot Mailed__________________
Inspector's Notice__________________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

Date ____________ Deputy Registrar ________________

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA- 正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申請人簽名

DATE-FECHA- 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION- 住址

Please mail ballot to me at: ________________
Por favor enviéme la balota por correo a:
Mailing address, if different from above:
Dirección Postal (si es diferente):

請將選票寄給本人住址 TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1481, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

In English:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials

In Spanish:

Descripción del impedimento/deficiencia
Iniciales del Votante

VOYANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1481 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente.

In English:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials

In Spanish:

Descripción del impedimento/deficiencia
Iniciales del Votante

VOTANTE AUSENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1481 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente.

In English:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials

In Spanish:

Descripción del impedimento/deficiencia
Iniciales del Votante

VOTANTE NO PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1481 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante no permanente.

In English:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials

In Spanish:

Descripción del impedimento/deficiencia
Iniciales del Votante

I hereby apply for a regular ballot:

Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante presente:

請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參
加上述所示之選舉。
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

| APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN  |
| REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., |
| TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984           |
| 7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.     |

申請缺席選票必須在選舉日七日之前
，即五月二十九日星期二下午五時經由
選民註冊官辦事處收到此申請表格。

| LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA |
| DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO |
| EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA |
| ELECCION.                                |

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Horr
Richard Cerbatos, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louis Hap Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Toni, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yuri Waia, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Estes

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which affect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlota Tedoro del Portillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clarence Oliva
Al Borice, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurdado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zuretti L. Gosdy, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sarah Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven nine members elected at large. At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board unless 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 they shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed

(Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249
NO  250

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn't have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it's working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let's put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they're able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn't result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can't afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco's Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Brit, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
Park Shadow Ban

PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253

NO 254

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: "Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time."

How "K" Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition "K".

Support Proposition "K".

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition "J" to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition "K". Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION K!

A "YES" vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON "K"

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Willinda McCrea
William Rubina
Margaret Brennan
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Bulkeley
Ella Cahn
Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lev
Richard Livingston
Bruce Ralof

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Duira
Rebecca Evans
Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner
Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hunicutt
Carol Negro
Ardon Danekas
Heide Chipka
Tim Lillywhite
Dick Grobholz
John Holtzclaw
Carl Pope
Miriam Blumenstein
Joyce Hall
Don Hurany
Robert Merkibauer
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city's parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let's approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It's entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let's do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco's many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Franciscans millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote "NO" on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

problems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”
Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor

Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

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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NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.
(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.
(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional rates paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(e) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, shall be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation.”

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be fifteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7,300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
proposition F, continued from page 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (c).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

proposition G

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the power to dissolve the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him by the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the term present in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board’s pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the offices of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary thereafter to be fixed in accordance with the salary-standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January, 1981. Thereafter, the term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be so limited as to provide that the members of the board shall serve for a term of four years.

At the general election in 1983 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof, whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof, whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof, whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof, whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials, shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (1) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (2) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental review have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration and in new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department shall make the investigation and report on the environmental impact of the project pursuant to the procedures set forth in the City Planning Commission's standards and procedures. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department shall make the investigation and report on the environmental impact of the project pursuant to the procedures set forth in the City Planning Commission's standards and procedures. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department shall make the investigation and report on the environmental impact of the project pursuant to the procedures set forth in the City Planning Commission's standards and procedures.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48

Application para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
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POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The “yes” or “no” on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
  • are a U.S. citizen.
  • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
  • are a resident of California, and
  • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there
  or
  • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  • your address when you signed up to vote,
  • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
  • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
## ELECTORAL PLAN

**DELEGATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democratic Party</th>
<th>Delegate Listing</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECCION PRIMARIA 5 DE JUNIO DE 1984</strong></td>
<td><strong>DELEGADOS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por no más de 8 delegados</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOCRATIC PARTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>DELEGATES</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELEGATES LISTING CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

---

**DEMONSTRATES PLEASE NOTE:**

This year the method of voting for president is different than at previous elections. Instead of voting for one presidential candidate, you will be voting for eight delegates. Pages 1 and 2 contain the names of 48 citizens who want to be delegates at the Democratic Convention to be held here in San Francisco. Each would-be delegate is pledged to support one of the six (6) presidential candidates. The names of the presidential candidates are printed in bold letter.(Continued on bottom of page 5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote for no more than 8 delegates</th>
<th>Vote por no más de 8 delegados</th>
<th>48 delegates are listed on pages 1 &amp; 2. Vote for no more than 8 of the 48 delegates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry Britt (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 delegados listados en páginas 1-2. Votar por 8 solamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Varner (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holtzclaw (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Thomas (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Lee (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance O'Connor (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Henry Kouba (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Torell (GARY HART)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Lantz (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn K. Lantz (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David L. Kilber (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Kilber (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael R. Hodgkiss (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy L. Huffman (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew A. Klein (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Konviser Ingraham (LYNDON LA ROUCHE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Weissberg (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest A. Bates (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herma Hill Kay (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry A. Francisco (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadie Redd (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy L. Larson (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Lin (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Walter (JOHN GLENN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF PRESIDENTIAL DELEGATE LISTING

(Continued from bottom of page 4)

Letters right below the would-be delegates names. Each presidential candidate has a slate of eight (8) delegates; the slates of delegates have been grouped together for your convenience.

You will probably want to cast your eight votes for the slate of 8 delegates representing the presidential candidate of your choice. If you do not want to do this, you can split your eight votes among two or more slates of delegates.

Under no circumstances should you vote for more than eight delegates (you may, however, vote for less than eight, if you wish).
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.

溪手話

STEP 1

Using both hands
Insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de voto 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 cabechas 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 al instrumento de voto y perforé con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use plumas ni lápices.

第三步
請把面側之選票針，由小孔內垂直插入
打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封
袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Representative in Congress — 5th District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SALA BURTON</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diputado al Congreso, Distrito #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EVELYN K. LANTZ</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(there is no contest for state senator in this district)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Representative in Congress — 5th District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DAVID L. KILBER</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the Assembly, 19th Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District #19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LOUIS J. PAPAN</strong></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Comite Central del Condado — Distrito #19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCION PRIMARIA 5 DE JUNIO DE 1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMITÉ DEL CONDADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Fraijo</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally B. Famarin</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Fazio</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Burton</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan M. Twomey</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D. Ingraham</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Konviser Ingraham</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan E. Kilber</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for no more than four (Vote por no mas de 4)

Vote for no more than four on both pages combined (Vote por no mas de 4 en ambas paginas combinadas)

Contest continued on next page (Continua en la siguiente pagina)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Susan Kelly Kennedy</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Joseph M. Hurley</td>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Arlo Smith</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Alexa Smith</td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>A. John Shimmon</td>
<td>Director, Board Equalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>David Looman</td>
<td>Labor Relations Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Godfrey Davidburg</td>
<td>Writer, Advertising Exec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Bob Geary</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOTE FOR NO MORE THAN FOUR ON BOTH PAGES COMBINED**

VOTE POR NO MAS DE 4 EN AMBAS PAGINAS COMBINADAS
### NONPARTISAN BALLOT

#### JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Number One</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>158 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>County Jail Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1984</td>
<td>163 →</td>
<td>164 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1984</td>
<td>167 →</td>
<td>168 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>California Park and Recreational Facilities Act of 1984</td>
<td>171 →</td>
<td>172 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Act of 1984</td>
<td>175 →</td>
<td>176 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Elected Officials</td>
<td>180 →</td>
<td>181 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE**

**JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL**

**Oficina Número Uno**

**Vote por Uno**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>158</th>
<th>ALBERT, C. WOLLENBERG, JR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juez de la Corte Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>地方法院法官</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>160</th>
<th>JONATHAN McCURDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado Defensor de Inquilinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>住客律師</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>163</th>
<th>SI 贷成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCELES DE CONDADO DE 1994.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárceles de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.00.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>167</th>
<th>SI 贷成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1994.** Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.00.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>171</th>
<th>SI 贷成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1994.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la específica adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, or restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación or para preservación histórica.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>175</th>
<th>SI 贷成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PEQUEÑOS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la especificada adquisición, engranecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>180</th>
<th>SI 贷成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>NO 反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS.** Desclasificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es desclasificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar el vacante.

**JUDICIAL**

**6F**
### Public Pension Fund Investments

**Number:** 21  
**Description:** Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.  
**Vote:** YES 185  
**Vote:** NO 186

### Exempt State Civil Service Positions

**Number:** 22  
**Description:** Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.  
**Vote:** YES 190  
**Vote:** NO 191

### Property Taxation. Seismic Safety Construction Exclusion

**Number:** 23  
**Description:** Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.  
**Vote:** YES 196  
**Vote:** NO 197

### Legislature: Rules, Procedures, Powers, Funding

**Number:** 24  
**Description:** Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.  
**Vote:** YES 204  
**Vote:** NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto depende de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta a más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ninguno efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades bimetales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce los asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite top se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

州立法，规定，程序，权力，办法。订定各委员会的各自组成部分的程序，投票程序和其他事项，削减议会费款。财政影响，州议会总支出将按一九八四年至八五财政年度原定的捐助减少$37,000,000。一九八四年至八五财政年度后，州议会的支出将旨在一最高限额。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A           | Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies? | YES 212  
NO 213 |
| B           | Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits? | YES 216  
NO 217 |
| C           | Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits? | YES 221  
NO 222 |
| E           | Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities? | YES 226  
NO 227 |
| F           | Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities? | YES 231  
NO 232 |
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberá pagarse a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 p.m. y las 7:00 a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de Ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

______________________________________________________

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
## VOTER SELECTION CARD

### CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>1 or 8.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presentational candidate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Committee*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G. Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H. Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I. Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberá cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J. Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K. Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedad del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY
My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.
My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

**PROPOSITION A.**

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

**How Supervisors Voted on “A”**

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Bill Maier, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, and Nancy Walker.

**NO:** Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

**Controller’s Statement on “A”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!
Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Neider
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sodonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerfato
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Denebeim
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hoppe
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Koff
Member, Board of Education

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission

Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission

Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raul Wallenberg Democratic Club

George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club

David Lozman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee

Joanne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party

Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club

Carole McGlen
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club

Sal Rosselli, President

Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club

Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it's good government.

Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it's fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.
San Francisco's police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.
San Francisco can't afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That's why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION "A". A YES vote on PROPOSITION "A" will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City's business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitation Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Pachew
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philbuthan
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udovitch
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn't allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family's health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it's like to have a job that doesn't cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It's time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women's Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaymes
Granavel A. Jackson
Dorothy Elliott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luise P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O'Brien

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaacks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Blatt
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

Buck Bagot
Diana Jaicks
Henry Der
Susan E. Walters
Elisabeth Jewell
Bety Brooks
Paula Pepe

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor 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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970’s, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unsppecific and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinar, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinar with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinar can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbegalata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business

of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller's Statement on “B”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year."

The text of Proposition B appears on page 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6½% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the "high crime" evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city's Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

"Night Differential" is as basic as "apple pie."
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest “Chuck” Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.

Vote Yes on Prop B.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate

Leisure Payne
Republican Central Committeeman
Stamley Bronnwell
Republican Central Committeeman
Demotix Mark
Republican Central Committeeman
Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committeeman
Lisa Klobucar
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committeeman

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeewoman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry “goes with the territory”. It is one of the reasons why a regular “entry rank” Q2 Patrolman’s annual “pay package” is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O’Keefe, Sr.
President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN
Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221 ▼
NO 222 ▼

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
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Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don't clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco's firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the "problem" alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco. Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
Hetch Hetchy Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "E" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "E" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City's General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy's facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "E" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Moneys in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facili-

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?  

YES  231
NO  232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: "Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time."
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “F” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “F” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to ap-

prove or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407.1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of

(Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?  

YES  236

NO  237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to replace the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240

NO 241

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to ensure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller's Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition "I".

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John Hoy
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Erect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinosa for Congress.

and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscans against San Franciscans. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition 1.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition 1.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-elect years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city, ethnicity, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Casamento, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscowitz
Bob McDonnell, Labours Local 261*
Pam Vanardell, Executive Director, SEIU Local 101*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Willie L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Burris, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleasby
Eric Cronen
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Grondin
Roma Guy, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holitzchek, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Juicis
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kellie, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Ponomares-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Bera
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Roqueval
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sils
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "b" Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andress, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Boci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Madeline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wiley Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblenz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表  June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:  
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at: 
Por favor envié la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above
Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCIÓN

Please mail ballot to me at: 
Por favor envié la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above
Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

Please mail ballot to me at: 
Por favor envié la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above
Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

FOR REGISTRAR’S USE ONLY

Prec. No.____________________
Ballot No.____________________
Ballot Mailed__________________
Inspector’s Notice_______________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:
__ Date __ Deputy Registrar

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA

SIGNATURE-FIRMA

DATE-FECHA

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the
requirement of Election Code Section 1431, I claim the below as my reason
for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter’s Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE

Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De
conformidad con los requisitos de la Sección 1431 del Código Electoral, pre-
sento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente
Permanente.

Descripción del
Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE

Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De
conformidad con los requisitos de la Sección 1431 del Código Electoral, pre-
sento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente
Permanente.

Descripción del
Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante
FROM:

_____________________________________

_____________________________________

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?  
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN  
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,  
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984  
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

申請缺席選票必須在選舉日前七日之前，即五月二十九日星期二下午五時前由選民登記官辦事處收到此申請表格。

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA  
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO  
DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 29 DE MAYO DE 1984,  
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA  
ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON  
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS  
155 CITY HALL  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hom
Richard Cerbaro, Commissioner, Board of Education
Piao Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Obregon
Al Borvice, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Walton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zuretti L. Gooby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sadonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women, and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness; VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

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

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
Jail Cost Reimbursement

PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gilham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can't be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It's only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they're convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRAN-
CFISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-
2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS
OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL
DETENTION FACILITY.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco:

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administra-
tive Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto,
reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover
Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as
the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of
monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the
California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the
defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, devel-
up a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs,
develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the
general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by
a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the
county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and com-
patible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs
of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination
made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed
annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of
incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The
board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is neces-
sary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the
collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California
Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Robert Cremer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans

Dan Sweeney
Jack Trujillo
Jane Winstead
Lottie Lawson

Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bienaoun, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Humlicek
Carol Negro
Ardell Donekas
Heide Chipp
Tim Lillyquist
Dick Grossholt
John Holtzclaw

Carl Pape
Miriam Blaustein
Joyce Hall
Don Horaney
Robert Muehlebner
Sunley J. Hertzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAY-GROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PRO-POSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bryzik
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants' Association
Garth Ferguson
President
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K”.  

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
K

Park Shadow Ban

VOTE NO ON "K"

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is "supposed" to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director
NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407–1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charters section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgment of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department shall report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 106 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year. Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall in-clude the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The standard rates of compensation as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strokers, fillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a)(1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a)(1), (2) and (3) and (c)(1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hatch Hetchy purposes or replacement of bonds or otherwise disposed of by the commission or as required by any Hatch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (c).

7.313 Hatch Hetchy Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hatch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hatch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1943, and provisions for the Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.
(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hatch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.
(c) Hatch Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing Hatch Hetchy water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under the commission’s jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

unformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided. Service shall not qualify as “satisfactory” if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate. Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;
(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;
(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.
principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeover type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names have been submitted to him by the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeover type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire
on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the
members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in
1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal
election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to
said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and
hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provision of this section or any other section of
the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members
of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of
January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date and the eleven
persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general
election in 1980 shall succeed to said office on said 8th day of January
1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of
supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the
six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said
election shall hold office for a term of four years, the five members
receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election
shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each
member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the
commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of
the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose
respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general
election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five
members of the board of supervisors shall be elected; and at the general
election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors
to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office
expire on the 8th day of January, 1985, and at the general elections in each
fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of
supervisors shall be elected.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure
that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the
jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and
Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City
Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance;
provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not
apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exeed
40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon
property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by,
the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after
sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be con-
structed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and
Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; struc-
tures of the same height and in the same location as structures in
place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit applica-
tion has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior
to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published
by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration
has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the
date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a
building permit application and an application for environmental
evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve
physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a
building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of
Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preser-
vation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United
States Department of the Interior on the National Register of His-
toric Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by
a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Plan-
ing Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the
issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this or-
dinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse im-
portant effect on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or desig-
nated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission be-
cause of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is deter-
mined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning
Commission shall not make the determination required by the provi-
sions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation
and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park
Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the
City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City
Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission,
after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of
the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall de-
termine which applications for building permits propose structures
which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdic-
tion of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park
Commission. As used in this subsection, “property designated for
acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission” shall mean
property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Com-
mision and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the
concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for ac-
quision from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund
which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recre-
ation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall
also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48

Applicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48

### POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

### WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. citizen.
- are at least 18 years of age on election day.
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your address when you signed up to vote,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"WITH SO MUCH VOTER APATHY, I LIKE TO THINK OF IT AS GETTING OUT THE VOTE..."

(Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.)

Fortunately, the type of activity depicted above rarely occurs in California elections. To help keep it that way, please report to the Registrar, in writing, any unlawful election activity you may be aware of.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

A 第四步
如何用自動投票機
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 1

Note: Si hace algun error, devuélvala 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."

C 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔與二紅點之上。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

D 第三步
請把帶釘之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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.

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

E 第五步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。

STEP 4

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TAREA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “SÍ” o después de la palabra “NO”.

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress—5th District</td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(There is no contest for State Senator In this District) (No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly—16th Assembly District</td>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GORDON A. BLOYER</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>State Central Committee/Miembro del Comité Central Estatal</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN WADSORTH</td>
<td>Bank Manager/Gerente Bancario/经理</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY E. MYERSCOUGH</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES DEAN MORROW</td>
<td>Businessman/Hombre de Negocios/商人</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER LANCE BOWMAN</td>
<td>Staffer, Elected Official/Funcionario, Oficial Electo/民選官員</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANLEY F. BRAMWELL</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL B. BASSI</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado/律师</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW JOHN BETANCOURT</td>
<td>Accountant/Contador/会计师</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWRENCE D. BECKER</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado/律师</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON A. BLOMAN</td>
<td>Business Owner/Propietario de Negocio/店主</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK A. JORDAN</td>
<td>Utility Representative/Representante de Servicio Público/公用事業代表</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES B. RULE</td>
<td>Advertising Assistant/Asistente de Publicidad/廣告助理</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIET R. ROSS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委員</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD J. HAZLEWOOD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委員</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID S. SIGAL</td>
<td>Businessman/Hombre de Negocios/商人</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委員</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY SPINOSA</td>
<td>Writer and Publisher/Escritora y Editora/作家，出版社人</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN H. NICHOLS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委員</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM N. POST, II</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado/律师</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td>President/Advisory Education Advisor/Consejero Presidencial en Educación/傳統教育顧問</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT COATES</td>
<td>Personnel Clerk/Oficinista de Personal/人事文員</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGNES I. CHAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委員</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Financial Consultant/Consultor Financiero/財政顧問</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Number One</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>158 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td>➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td>➡️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>163 ➡️</td>
<td>164 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>167 ➡️</td>
<td>168 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>171 ➡️</td>
<td>172 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>175 ➡️</td>
<td>176 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate’s defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>180 ➡️</td>
<td>181 ➡️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

#### JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Acta Description</th>
<th>Spanish Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos de Desembolso de Capital para Carceles de Condado de 1984</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación y reemplazo de cárcel de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento y reparación de los mismos conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para la Construcción de Nuevas Prisiones de 1984</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelación y mantenimiento apilado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Acta de Parque e Instalaciones de Recreación de California de 1984</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Acta de Engranamiento de los Recursos Pesqueros y del Ámbito Natural de Vida Silvestre de 1984</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engranamiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Funcionarios Elegidos</td>
<td>Declara que cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente, Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrán incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### JUDICIAL
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185  NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190  NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196  NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204  NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto depende de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL.
Enmenda Constitucional Legislativa. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos del director del sistema de jubilación de los empleados públicos. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS.
Enmenda Constitucional Legislativa. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérvida desconocida de rendimientos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de rendimientos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades estatales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de rendimientos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los rendimientos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN.
Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidista de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolida para la Legislatura.
A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212

NO 213

B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216

NO 217

C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221

NO 222

E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226

NO 227

F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231

NO 232
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberá pagárselas a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2.125% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7.125%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos para el Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!

"Nothing could be more important to the future of our nation than your support for the Republican Party. Our ability to elect more Republicans to office in November depends on your help now.

Elections aren’t won on Election Day—they are won in the months before, when Republicans join together to build a strong organization. Your support for the California Republican Party is critically needed. Please, join us today."

— Ronald Reagan
REPUBLICAN PARTY 1984 VICTORY FUND

From: __________________________ NAME __________________________

________________________ ADDRESS __________________________

________________________ CITY __________________________

________________________ STATE ZIP CODE __________________________

I want to help the Republican Party win a major victory this year!

( ) Here's my personal check for the Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund. I'm sending:

□ $15 □ $25 □ $50 □ $100 □ Other __________________________

(Please make check payable to: Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund)

( ) I want to volunteer my time. My telephone #

is ( ) __________________________

Please return this form with your contribution. Many thanks.
Paid for by the California Republican Party.

Please detach the form above, fill it out, and return it with your donation!
TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to "yes" or "no." This number will appear on your ballot.

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presentational candidate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Committee*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

236 SI 贏成
237 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

240 SI 贏成
241 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

244 SI 贏成
245 NO 反對

¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

249 SI 贏成
250 NO 反對

¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquéllos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?

253 SI 贏成
254 NO 反對

¿Debería ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

240 SI 贏成
241 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

244 SI 贏成
245 NO 反對

¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

249 SI 贏成
250 NO 反對

¿Debería adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquéllos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES  212
NO   213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?

1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great! It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees. Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone. Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City. Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

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

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.
It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.
PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!
Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.
PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.
PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.
VOTE FOR PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sodonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Donanheim
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kenf
Member, Board of Education
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Audo
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Leeman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government.

Vote yes on Proposition A.

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result. Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does. San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board

Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitacion Valley Merchants Association

Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association

Robert Parot
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association

Harry Phillohan
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty

Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association

Joe Ustrich
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church

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

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luise P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O’Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agor Joice
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tess Rousseau
Ron Huberman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition "A".

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to "collectively bargain" for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition "A" would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just one year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote "NO" on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say "yes" or "no" to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of govern-
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970’s, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

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

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition "B" will bring fairness and equity to the City's work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition "B" would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition "B" grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition "B". It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City's Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff's Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, "night differential" certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 1/2% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote "YES" on Proposition B.

_Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp_

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote "YES" on Proposition B.

_Milton Marks_

State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the "high crime" evening and night time hours.

_Al Nelder_

_David Sanchez_

_Jo Daly_

_Burl Toler_

Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city's Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

_Jane McKaskle Murphy_

Former Police Commissioner

_Arlo Smith_

District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

_I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B._

_Lee Dolson_

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

"Night Differential" is as basic as "apple pie."
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee Chairman
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committee Chairman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner

Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Stanley Bronwwell
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Devin Mark
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Congressional Candidate

Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Lisa Klobucar
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE.
PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221
NO 222

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commissioner President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE EMAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID/TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER!
In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition “C” will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition “C” simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

(b) The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "E" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "E" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City's General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library, and the other facilities supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy's facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "E" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priorities: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231

NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time."

Polls are open from 7AM to 8PM

The Text of Proposition F Begins on Page 39
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “F” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “F” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of

(Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place.

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240
NO  241

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

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

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer. This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Brumwell
Republican Central Committeeeman

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeeman

State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeeman

Former City Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Elect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinosa for Congress,

and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city’s ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Castito, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Vornicchi, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogles, President 3F National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Mahler
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
AGAINT PROPOSITION I

DO YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Alemo
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleary
Eric Craven
Gwenn Craig, Chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Foye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendorfer
Roma Guy, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holsclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Apar Jaicks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kelliker, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kitroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Palomares-Criollo*
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Rayn
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rouvel
Tom Saunders
San Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "b" Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "I".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Madeline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*
*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblenz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we reduce the chance that our neighbors...
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER</th>
<th>VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE</th>
<th>&quot;永入缺席選票&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status.</td>
<td>Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, pre-</td>
<td>本人在此申請永入缺席選票申請, 根據選舉法章第</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Handicap/Disability</td>
<td>Descripción del</td>
<td>“永入缺席選票”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter’s Initials</td>
<td>Impedimentos/Incapacidad</td>
<td>申請的理由。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                | Iniciales del Votante | 申請

FOR REGISTRAR’S USE ONLY
Prec. No.________________
Ballot No.________________
Ballot Mailed________________
Inspector’s Notice,________________
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

Date ____________________________
Deputy Registrar ____________________
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION? (¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA DEL REGISTRADOR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 29 DE MAYO DE 1984,
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Make Your Vote Truly Count—Support The Republican Party!

Your vote is critical – but it is just one vote!

Why not make it multiply (and help your candidates win) by sending a few dollars now to the Republican Party’s Victory Fund and/or volunteer a few hours of your time as we head into the November elections?

In addition to Ronald Reagan, every Republican candidate who wins in the June primary will depend heavily on us to provide the campaign services and resources they need for victory. Send us $15 or $20 now, and we’ll have the funds on hand to pay for advertising, polling and get-out-the-vote mailings, and statewide organization.

Your check now means we can reach hundreds more voters, just as we have reached you. Won’t you please help? Lift this flap now and show your support for the entire Republican team!
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hom
Richard Cervidez, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Yang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mort, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlos Texidor del Porrillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Ohrean
Al Borvice, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zaretty L. Goosby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sodonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.
2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.
2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisiorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisiorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed

(Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles—and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J—Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.

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

PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

\[ \text{YES} \quad 253 \quad \text{NO} \quad 254 \]

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**The Way It Is Now:** The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

**The Proposal:** Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

**A Yes Vote Means:** If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

**A No Vote Means:** If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

**Controller’s Statement on “K”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time.”

**How “K” Got on Ballot**

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Willinda McCree
William Knits
Margaret Brenman
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Bulkey
Ellis Cabin
Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lee
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rafil

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks is shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

Amy Meyer
Keith Eickman
Tommy Harris
Frances McKeever
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Yrneyes
Tom Malloy, General Manager

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Diarra
Rebecca Evans
Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Dan Sweeney
Jack Trujillo
June Windrow
Lorraine Lawson

Carl Pope
Miriam Blaustein
Joyce Hall
Don Horroy
Robert Muehlbauer
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Robero Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical “common sense” politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Catalina Tenants Association
Leroy Lowe
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bystiek
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants’ Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feuer
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on “K”.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city's parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let's approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
lens occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON "K"

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is "supposed" to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor

Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day
NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 59% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor and shall receive equivalent time credit to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other paid absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”. Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to multi-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the said report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strokeemen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirty-three percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereafter issued; and (5) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hatchey Hetchy Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hatchey Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hatchey project, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.
(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hatchey project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.
(c) Hatchey Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing Hatchey water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under the commission's jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7,300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors. 
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.467 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities owned or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7,300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition
The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him by the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary
The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.
The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief administrative officer, to prescribe general rules and regulations for the administrative service under his control; to have a voice but no vote in the board of supervisors, with the right to report on or to discuss any matter before the said board concerning the affairs of the departments in his charge; to make such recommendations and propose such measures to the mayor, the board of supervisors, or committees thereof, concerning the affairs of the city and county in his charge as he may deem necessary; to coordinate the functioning of the several departments of the city and county charged with powers and duties relating to control of traffic; and to provide for the budgeting and control of publicity and advertising expenditures of the city and county.
The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the offices of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefore to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint his executive assistant who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. The general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years; thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be held in November 1971, shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be held in 1980 shall be as follows: the four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of six years; the six members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years; thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior service of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in existence on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
558-3061

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

BALLOT TYPE

01R

REPUBLICAN
16th Assembly District
8th Senate District
5th Congressional District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
1200's, 1400's.

Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊登在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

- Voting Instructions: Page 4
- Sample Ballot: Pages 4-17
- Your rights as a voter: Page 3
- Words you need to know: Page 18
- Handicapped information: Pages 18, 64
- Absentee ballot application: (card insert)
- Voter Selection coupon: (card insert)
- Location of your polling place: Page 64

CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

- Jonathan McCurdy: Page 19
- Albert C. Wollenberg: Page 19

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Would empower the Supervisors to grant employee benefits under certain circumstances.

- Analysis: Page 20
- Arguments: Pages 30-32
- Legal Text: Page 59

PROPOSITION B

Would grant night differential pay to police officers.

- Analysis: Page 29
- Arguments: Pages 30-32
- Legal Text: Page 59

PROPOSITION C

Would grant additional pay to firefighters with 10, 15, and 20 years of satisfactory service.

- Analysis: Page 33
- Arguments: Pages 34, 35
- Legal Text: Pages 35, 59-61

PROPOSITION D

Proposition D was withdrawn by the Board of Supervisors on March 12.

PROPOSITION E

Would allow certain types of Hetch Hetchy bonds to be issued without going on the ballot.

- Analysis: Page 36
- Arguments: Page 37
- Legal Text: Pages 37, 61

PROPOSITION F

Would allow certain types of Water Department bonds to be issued without going on the ballot.

- Analysis: Page 38
- Arguments: Page 39
- Legal Text: Pages 39, 62

PROPOSITION G

Would allow the appointment of 2 Retirement System managers, exempt from the Civil Service process.

- Analysis: Page 40
- Arguments: Page 41
- Legal Text: Page 62

PROPOSITION H

Would establish the Recorder as an independent agency, under the CAO.

- Analysis: Page 42
- Arguments: Page 43
- Legal Text: Pages 62, 63

PROPOSITION I

Would reduce the number of Supervisors from 11 to 7 and would change supervisory elections to odd-numbered years.

- Analysis: Page 44
- Arguments: Pages 45-50
- Legal Text: Pages 50, 63

PROPOSITION J

Would allow the City to charge prisoners for the cost of jail, if they can afford to pay.

- Analysis: Page 51
- Arguments: Pages 52, 53
- Legal Text: Page 53

PROPOSITION K

With exceptions, would regulate the construction of buildings that cast shadows on parks & playgrounds.

- Analysis: Page 54
- Arguments: Pages 55-58
- Legal Text: Page 63

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Roberta Borvanova, Stephanie Salter and Susan Kwock. They were assisted by Thomas Toomey of the City Attorney’s Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:

- are a U.S. citizen.
- are at least 18 years of age on election day.
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:

- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"WITH SO MUCH VOTER APATHY, I LIKE TO THINK OF IT AS GETTING OUT THE VOTE..."

(Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.)

Fortunately, the type of activity depicted above rarely occurs in California elections. To help keep it that way, please report to the Registrar, in writing, any unlawful election activity you may be aware of.
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."

STEP 1

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 cabezuelas rojas.

C 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 perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票选出之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格预备为投票人应用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO". All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TAREA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfóra la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfóra la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfóra la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfóra, rompe o estrupe la balota, o rompe o estrupe el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請在投票記錄器上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

投票時所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩位或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不要超過該選舉的規定人數。

投票合格的非候選人候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供的預定空白上寫下該候選人所競選的職位和候選人的姓名。

投票任何選案，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有顯著污點或模糊者，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，撕裂或弄損了，或撕裂了，弄損了非候選候選人的選票信封，應把該選票遞給選舉區的選舉員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress—5th District</td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator—3rd Senatorial District</td>
<td>MILTON MARKS</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly—16th Assembly District</td>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GORDON A. BLOYER</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>State Central Committeeman/Miembro del Comité Central Estatal</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN WADSWORTH</td>
<td>Bank Manager/Gerente Bancario</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY E. MYERSCOUGH</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES DEAN MORROW</td>
<td>Businessman/Hombre de Negocios/</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER LANCE BOWMAN</td>
<td>Staffer, Elected Official/Funcionario, Oficial Electo/</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANLEY F. BRAMWELL</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL B. BASSI</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW JOHN BETANCOURT</td>
<td>Accountant/Contador/</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWRENCE D. BECKER</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON A. BLOYER</td>
<td>Business Owner/Propietario de Negocio/</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK A. JORDAN</td>
<td>Utility Representative/Representante de Servicio Público/</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES B. RULE</td>
<td>Advertising Assistant/Asistente de Publicidad/</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIET ROSS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD J. HAZLEWOOD</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID S. SIGAL</td>
<td>Businessman/Hombre de Negocios/</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY SPINOSA</td>
<td>Writer and Publisher/Escritora y Editora/</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN H. NICHOLS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM N. POST, II</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td>Presidential Education Advisor/Consejero Presidencial en Educación/</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT COATES</td>
<td>Personnel Clerk/Oficinista de Personal/</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGNES I. CHAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Financial Consultant/Consultor Financiero/</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT
Office Number One
Vote for One

ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR
Judge of Municipal Court

JONATHAN McCURDY
Tenant Attorney

158

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

16 COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984.
This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling,
and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred
maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.

YES 163

NO 164

17 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act
provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred
maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue
of $300,000,000.

YES 167

NO 168

18 CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT
OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be
used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or resto-
ration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical
preservation purposes.

YES 171

NO 172

19 FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF
1984: This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be avail-
able for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the
State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement,
and development of habitat areas.

YES 175

NO 176

20 ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slan-
derous campaign statements are made that are major contributing
cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fis-
cal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local govern-
ments could incur additional election costs if an election is required
to fill vacancy.

YES 180

NO 181
### Disposiciones Sometidas al Voto de los Electores — Proposiciones Estatales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Texto de la Proposición</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos de Desembolso de Capital para Carceles de Condado de 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárceles de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento ampliado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para la Construcción de Nuevas Prisiones de 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento ampliado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Acta de Parque e Instalaciones de Recreación de California de 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Acta de Engranecimiento de los Recursos Pesqueros y del Ámbito Natural de Vida Silvestre de 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $65,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la especificada adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Funcionarios Elegidos. Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS

Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS

Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPERTY TAXATION, SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION

Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING

Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta a más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD, EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sísmos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades bienales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición parteraria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sosténimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sosténimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37,000,000 de la cantidad que de otra manera habría sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%; providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los proporcionados a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberán pagárseles a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!

"Nothing could be more important to the future of our nation than your support for the Republican Party. Our ability to elect more Republicans to office in November depends on your help now.

Elections aren’t won on Election Day—they are won in the months before, when Republicans join together to build a strong organization. Your support for the California Republican Party is critically needed. Please, join us today."

- Ronald Reagan
REPUBLICAN PARTY 1984 VICTORY FUND

From: ________________________________

NAME

______________________________

ADDRESS

______________________________

CITY

______________________________

STATE [ZIP CODE]

I want to help the Republican Party win a major victory this year!

( ) Here's my personal check for the Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund. I'm sending:

☐ $15 ☐ $25 ☐ $50 ☐ $100 ☐ Other _______________________

(Please make check payable to: Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund)

( ) I want to volunteer my time. My telephone # is ( )____________________

OCCUPATION (REQUIRED BY LAW)

______________________________________

OFFICIAL SIGNATURE

Please return this form with your contribution. Many thanks.
Paid for by the California Republican Party.

Please detach the form above, fill it out, and return it with your donation!
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrador?

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES; IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

PULLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M. Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

 trái: de la anterior; de la cualiciones

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

PULLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M. Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

trhle los strucreas bré pro-in y Parle autor-funcipal estas ex-
VOTER SELECTION CARD

CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presentional candidate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| U.S. Congress Representative |
| 1. |

| State Senator (if applicable) |
| 1. |

| State Assembly |
| 1. |

| County Committee* |
| 1. |

| 2. |

| 3. |

| 4. |

| 5. |

| 6. |

| 7. |

| 8. |

| 9. |

| 10. |

| (Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.) |

| Muni Court Judge |
| 1. |

| STATE |
| YES | NO |
| 16 | 163 | 164 |
| 17 | 167 | 168 |
| 18 | 171 | 172 |
| 19 | 175 | 176 |
| 20 | 180 | 181 |
| 21 | 185 | 186 |
| 22 | 190 | 191 |
| 23 | 196 | 197 |
| 24 | 204 | 205 |

| CITY & COUNTY |
| YES | NO |
| 212 | 213 |
| 216 | 217 |
| 221 | 222 |
| 226 | 227 |
| 231 | 232 |
| 236 | 237 |
| 240 | 241 |
| 244 | 245 |
| 248 | 250 |
| 253 | 254 |

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
G. ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H. ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I. ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J. ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobro de los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K. ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A. Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance.

San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right.

In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let's make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!
Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco's growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION "A", we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States.

But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION "A", our loss will be these cities' and counties' gain.

Take stock in San Francisco's future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers' money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance.

This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone. Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it. It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION "A" will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn't give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco's labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city's best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco's basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let's keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

PROPOSITION "A" will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION "A" would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION "A" would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION "A" would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION "A" gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.
VOTE for PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sadonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Denehein
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren DeMerrit
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It's the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can't negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Avlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Midget
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Roselli, President
Alice B. Tolkin Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it's good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bar-

gain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women's Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaymes
Grandvel A. Jackson
Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes
Mattie Scott
Martha Simmons
Forrest Pritchett
Gloria Johnson
Matilda Whetstone
Mildred Sorrells
Ben Johnson
Bessie Stoneham
Janece Reynolds
Constance Rodgers
Tommie Steele Jr.
Rhonda Darrett
Robert B. Johnson Jr.
Gregory E. Fields
Gwendolyn Thibodeaux
Juanita Francis
Albert R. Carter
Annie V. Bradford
Anthony Wagner
Beatrice Brown
Eliska Mobley
Garrett Smith
Loanna Meachum
Madison J. Bland
Reverend Johnnie Robinson
Arthur Keilough
Mary-Ellen W. Carr
Aubrey V. Jackques
Rufus Cunn
Dorothy J. Kelsey
Anna Dolly Taylor
William Bailey
Gloria Duke
Lyneta Haynes
Arthur W. Rose
Dorothy Elliott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O'Brien
Virginia Lloenda
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg
Sally Bif
Amor Cruz
John Garth
Bryna Ballin
Lily Tsou
Eva Tan
Germaine Uribe
Pat Hoover
Lloyd C. Jackson
Nova Bevel
Brenda Barros
Jean Pacchino
Carolyn Davis
Laurie Smith
Mike Riffkin
Margaret Kahn
Janet L. Kallet, R.N.
Shoshana Silverman
Lorraine Anne Thiehaud
Evelyn Hannah
Bobbie Yancey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaicks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus
Marie Jobling
Tess Rosveral
Ron Hiderman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.
San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

Buck Bagot
Diana Jaacks
Henry DeR
Susan E. Walters
Elizabeth Jewel
Betty Brooks
Paula Pede

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of govern-ment, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970’s, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the “voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

William F. O’Keefe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
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Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216

NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition "B" will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition "B" would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition "B" grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition "B". It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.
Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6¼% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not. This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.). The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most: the "high crime" evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Tolier
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city's Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

"Night Differential" is as basic as "apple pie."
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest “Chuck” Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority, length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Bob Silverst
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Max Woods
Republican State Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner

Tom Spina
Republican Central Committee
Congressional Candidate

Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committee
Stanley Brunwell
Republican Central Committee

Rep. Dennis Marks
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Shirley Spina
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Lisa Kehoe
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committee
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry “goes with the territory”! It is one of the reasons why a regular “entry rank” Q2 Patrolman’s annual “pay package” is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police

William F. O’Keefe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE.
Firefighter Longevity Pay

**PROPOSITION C**

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221
NO 222

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “C”**

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “C”**

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year."

---

**USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING**

(SEE INSERT)

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35**
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent "on-the-front line" fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay "on-the-front line", and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition "C", a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commissioner President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre "TIME SERVED" proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual "pay package" for a regular "entry rank" H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent "RAPID TURN-OVER" problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter's Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition "C".

If passed, this "longevity of service" premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "C".

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition “C” will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition “C” simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

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

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226

NO 227

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City's water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: "Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Proposition "E" would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "E" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "E" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City's General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy's facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "E" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "E".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(n) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter, whenever revenue bonds are issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy Project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into such fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(6) Moneys in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereof, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance, and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated, or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of debt service; and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require in accordance with (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds; (4) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds; and (5) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231 ♦
NO 232 ♦

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government cannot be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 9PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F"

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn-out facilities. Proposition "F" would allow the Water Department to issue revenue bonds to replace facilities of any kind, such as equipment and facilities if 1/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors to allow the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayer; generally, since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipeline, dams, filtration plants, and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a breakdown in the valve produces the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would create a better way to retain the taxpayers' power to approve all projects and new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submit it to the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject "Water Department revenue bond issues."

Consolidated County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARter AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

Note: These sections are entirely new.

§ 6.80F. Water Department Revenue Bond

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this Charter, whenever revenue bonds are issued by the Public Utility Commission pursuant to section 6.612 with outstanding water rate revenue of the Water Department shall be added as a local debt of the city and county treasury, but known as the "Water Department Revenue Bond". All revenue arising and derived from such bonds shall be invested in the operating expenses, expenditures to maintain the operation of the Water Department and shall be accounted for in a separate account, separate from all other city and county funds. The bond authorized by this section shall be issued in two series: (1) immediately after the election and (2) the year following the election, the first series to be voted on at the election in November of the first year following this Charter amendment. The amount of bonds shall not exceed the amount of proposed expenses as described in the budget and fiscal provisions of this Charter amendment.

(b) The proceeds of the Water Department Revenue Bond shall be used to acquire, improve, maintain and operate the water, treatment, and distribution facilities of the Water Department; to construct additional facilities; to provide for the operation of the Water Department; and to acquire or finance other property necessary for the performance of the duties of the Water Department.

(c) The issuance of the Water Department Revenue Bond is subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, who shall have the right to call for a public hearing on any bond issue submitted to them, and who shall have the right to determine the amount, terms, and conditions of the bonds.

(d) The bond issue shall be subject to the provisions of this Charter and the Public Utilities Act of 1939, as amended, and to the provisions of any future legislation enacted by the City and County of San Francisco.
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 3 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application
is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.
Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1921, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees' Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn't be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don't weaken our city's merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let's keep these two positions under place.

Civil Service

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 150 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

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

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder's duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder's office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder's Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder's job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It's like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City's elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder's office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate "red tape", delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,334 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.
Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.
Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate

George Redmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knie Burke, Consul General of murderous COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Robert Guichard
Businessman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).
Elect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinoza for Congress.

Shirley Brumwell
Republican Central Committee
Tom Spinoza
Republican Congressional Candidate
Shirley Spinoza
Republican Central Committee Candidate

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Robert Guichard
Businessman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner
John Moy
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Shirley Brumwell
Republican Central Committee
Tom Spinoza
Republican Congressional Candidate
Shirley Spinoza
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscans against San Franciscans. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our city and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscans needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board's decisions will be less reflective of the voters' thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco's voters.

The people behind this proposition aren't telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won't be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won't work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won't make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can't run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It's time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al. Castulo, President, S.F. Police Officers' Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Pual Veracalli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women's Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Muher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabth Anello
John Badige, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleasby
Erie Crooks
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendorfer
Roma Gay, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holteaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jaicks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kellther, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kirroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margaret Kaufmann
Steve M. Kreipling, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*
Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Palomaros-Crittops
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Pinner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Ray
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rouerdel
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sils
Arthur Siion
Peter Serra
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary valves
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "b" Waese, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Maura Keesley
Dennis A. Antone
Beate Wallace Landis, Democratic Women's Forum*
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*
Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Madeline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Blopher, Member, Republican County Central Committee*
*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:
• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblentz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudi
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I.
Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTEAUSENTE
缺席選票申請表  June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

请寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加上述所示之選舉。

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY

Prec. No._________________
Ballot No._________________
Ballot Mailed_________________
Inspector's Notice_________________
Signature and Registration Verified as Correct:

__________________________
Date

__________________________
Deputy Registrar

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA- 正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申請人簽名

DATE-FECHA- 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION- 住址:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor enviéme la balota por correo:

 TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the
requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason
for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

VOTANTEAUSENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De
conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral,
presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente
Permanente.

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter's Initials ____________

Descripción del
Impedimento/incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante___________

日本語

永久缺席選民
本人在此於舊金山市內申請永久
缺席選民身份。根據選舉法典第
一四五一段的要求，我在下表說明我
申請成為永久缺席選民身份的原因。

説明障障情形和性質
選民姓名__
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO
DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 29 DE MAYO DE 1984,
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Take Your Vote Truly Count—Support The Republican Party!

Your vote is critical – but it is just one vote!

Why not make it multiply (and help your candidates win) by sending a few dollars now to the Republican Party's Victory Fund and/or volunteer a few hours of your time as we head into the November elections?

In addition to Ronald Reagan, every Republican candidate who wins in the June primary will depend heavily on us to provide the campaign services and resources they need for victory. Send us $15 or $20 now, and we'll have the funds on hand to pay for advertising, polling and get-out-the-vote mailings, and statewide organization.

Your check now means we can reach hundreds more voters, just as we have reached you. Won't you please help? Lift this flap now and show your support for the entire Republican team!
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Terry Pimsleur, Terry Pimsleur and Company
Aileen C. Hernandez, Aileen C. Hernandez Associates
Fred Ateyeh, President, Independent Grocers Association*
Walter G. Jebe, Jebe's Kompact Kamera
Dana Walsh, President, Greater Clement Street Merchants Association*

*Organization listed for identification purposes only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zuretti L. Gooby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sadonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

PROPOSITION I

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249
NO 250

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

"Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time."

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47.00 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madeline A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47.000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERE TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.

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

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Willinda McCrea
William Kuhn
Margaret Brennan
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Baldrey
Ella Cahn

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans
Amy Meyer
Keith Eickman
Tommy Harris
Frances McAfee
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Ynegas
Tom Malloy, General Manager

Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bieman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Laudis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hunicutt
Carol Negro
Arden Danekas
Heidi Chipp
Tom Lillyquist
Dick Greathall
John Holtzclaw

Carl Pope
Miriam Blausen
Joyce Hall
Don Horany
Robert Muchlauer
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keefe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEeman.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAY-GROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Bred Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bysteck
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants' Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feese
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote "NO" on Proposition K.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

VOTE NO ON "K"

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Gihardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefore or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.
The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.
Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.
For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.
The term “police officers or patrolmen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year. Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stroke, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsections (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of each year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue in effect until such time as the new schedules are adopted or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.

Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 3 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1945, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54386, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (c).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the term presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board’s pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1976 shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1972, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members elected to the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Therefore, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1972, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunset and for the last hour before sunrise; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational or park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALLOT TYPE</th>
<th>02R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th Assembly District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Senate District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Congressional District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48**

**Application para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48**

**缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁**

**POLL WORKERS NEEDED**

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

**WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:**

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION
Voting Instructions
Sample Ballot
Your rights as a voter
Words you need to know
Handicapped information
Absentee ballot application
Voter Selection coupon
Location of your polling place

CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE
Jonathan McCurdy
Albert C. Wollenberg

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A
Would empower the Supervisors to grant employee benefits under certain circumstances.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION B
Would grant night differential pay to police officers.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION C
Would grant additional pay to firefighters with 10, 15 and 20 years of satisfactory service.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION D
Proposition D was withdrawn by the Board of Supervisors on March 12.

PROPOSITION E
Would allow certain types of Hetch Hetchy bonds to be issued without going on the ballot.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION F
Would allow certain types of Water Department bonds to be issued without going on the ballot.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION G
Would allow the appointment of 2 Retirement System managers, exempt from the Civil Service process.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION H
Would establish the Recorder as an independent agency, under the CAO.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION I
Would reduce the number of Supervisors from 11 to 7 and would change supervisory elections to odd-numbered years.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION J
Would allow the City to charge prisoners for the cost of jail, if they can afford to pay.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

PROPOSITION K
With exceptions, would regulate the construction of buildings that cast shadows on parks & playgrounds.
Analysis
Arguments
Legal Text

CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Roberta Borganova, Stephanie Salter and Susan Kwock. They were assisted by Thomas Toomey of the City Attorney's Office.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. citizen.
- are at least 18 years of age on election day.
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your address when you signed up to vote,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"With so much voter apathy, I like to think of it as getting out the vote."

(Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.)

Fortunately, the type of activity depicted above rarely occurs in California elections. To help keep it that way, please report to the Registrar, in writing, any unlawful election activity you may be aware of.
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

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

**STEP 1**

Insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

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

**STEP 2**

Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

**STEP 3**

Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

**STEP 4**

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.
INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.
To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".
All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.
If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.
INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.
Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.
Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "Sí" o después de la palabra "No".
Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfura, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票紀錄機上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

投票時所選舉的任何其他候選人；請在選票上填寫所指之候選人名打孔。如果選票上有兩個或以上
候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上填寫所指之所有候選人中，盡選你要投選的候選人打孔，但不
要超過所選舉的規定人數。
選舉合格的非候選的候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供的選舉空位上填下該候選人
所競選的職位和候選人的姓名。
選選任何提案，請在選票上打孔設指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。
選票上若有顯著污點或無疑者，選票作廢。
如果你在選票上打孔錯了，撕破或弄壞了；或撕壞了、弄壞了非候選候選人的選票信封，應
把該選票退給選舉區的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress—6th District</td>
<td>DOUGLAS BINDERUP</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GREGORY BAKA</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator—3rd Senatorial District</td>
<td>MILTON MARKS</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly—17th Assembly District</td>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDIE WALLACE</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman/Mujer Miembro del Comité Central Estatal/州中央委员会成员</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN BENJAMIN MOY</td>
<td>Attorney-Investor/Abogado-Inversionista/律师/投资者</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
<td>Accountant/Contador/会计师</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER G. BAKOS</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultor/顾问</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FERDINAND TERHEYDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON</td>
<td>College Teacher/Profesor Universitario/大学教师</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.F. O'KEEFFE, SR.</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. LESTER O'SHEA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHY HENDERSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. SIMPSON</td>
<td>Financial Services Representative/Representante de Servicios Financieros/财政服务代表</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL SHER</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado/律师</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE PAYNE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE J. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>Attorney at law/Abogado/律师</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLPH ANDREWS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/现任委员</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. DEREK ANDERSON</td>
<td>Chairman, President, Stockbroker/Presidente, Bolsista/董事会主席，总裁，股票经纪</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>Retired Navy Nurse/Enfermera Jubilada de la Marina/退休海军护士</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>County Jail Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>California Park and Recreational Facilities Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Elected Officials. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate’s defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artículo</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Resumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCEL DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárceles de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la específica adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engranquecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS.** Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.

Fiscal: $85,000,000,000,000.00. Permite la compra de materias para el sistema de protección de vida silvestre. Entrega de fondos para la conservación de la vida silvestre.
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.

Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Déclara las haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependiendo de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURO CONTRA SISMOS ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de derechos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de derechos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los impuestos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Específica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite top se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

州公教員的免許。公教員退休制度和州教員退休制度的若干指定位職可從免於公務制度；財政影響；無直接影響，但如選擇人員靈活性的增加影響到投資計劃的執行時，則可能產生間接影響。

物業税，地震安全建築免絕收稅。凡是地震安全進行的具體指定位職可出現物業稅。財政影響，地方政府物業稅的增加及增加的徵收費用，其數額不詳，州為補償學校。社區大學，可能還有地方政府的其他收入的損失，所增加的財政數額不詳，由於物業稅扣稅額減低，州所得稅收入略增。

州議會，規則，程序，權力，撥款，制訂各委員會各點規定的程序，投票規定和 其他事項，削減後勤經費撥款，財政影響，州議會經費突破到八四至八五財政年度規定的撥款減少 $37,000,000。八四至八五財政年度後，州議會經費的增長將訂出最高限額。
### NONPARTISAN BALLOT

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberá pagárseles a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

F. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Educación para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?  

YES 236  
NO 237  

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?  

YES 240  
NO 241  

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?  

YES 244  
NO 245  

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?  

YES 249  
NO 250  

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?  

YES 253  
NO 254
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!

"Nothing could be more important to the future of our nation than your support for the Republican Party. Our ability to elect more Republicans to office in November depends on your help now. Elections aren’t won on Election Day—they are won in the months before, when Republicans join together to build a strong organization. Your support for the California Republican Party is critically needed. Please, join us today."

— Ronald Reagan
From: ___________________________
               NAME

               ADDRESS

               CITY

               STATE    ZIP CODE

OCCUPATION (REQUIRED BY LAW)

OFFICIAL SIGNATURE

I want to help the Republican Party win a major victory this year!

(  ) Here's my personal check for the Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund. I'm sending:

  ☐ $15  ☐ $25  ☐ $50  ☐ $100  ☐ Other ___________________________

(Please make check payable to: Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund)

(  ) I want to volunteer my time. My telephone # is (  )__________________

Please return this form with your contribution. Many thanks. Paid for by the California Republican Party.

Please detach the form above, fill it out, and return it with your donation!
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to "yes" or "no." This number will appear on your ballot.

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

## CANDIDATES

### President
1 or 8.**

(**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presidential candidate)

### U.S. Congress Representative
1.

### State Senator (if applicable)
1.

### State Assembly
1.

### County Committee*
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.*
6.*
7.*
8.*
9.*
10.*

(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)

### Muni Court Judge
1.

## STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>¿Deberá el Secretario Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?</td>
<td><strong>Sí</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Volantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?</td>
<td><strong>Sí</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?</td>
<td><strong>Sí</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?</td>
<td><strong>Sí</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?</td>
<td><strong>Sí</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY
My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won't be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don't vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.
My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?

1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let's make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance.

This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION "A" will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient workforce means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION "A" will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION "A" would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION "A" would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION "A" would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION "A" gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.

VOTE FOR PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Susan Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatos
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Denechim
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education

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

Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits.

Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits.

Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government.

Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making correct decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church

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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance? Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women's Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Grandvel A. Jackson
Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Laura Pascoe
Martha Ryan
Maria O'Brien
Virginia Lozada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaicks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate. San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees. Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor 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.
A

Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970’s, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecific and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

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

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee.

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition "B" will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition "B" would extend this benefit to police officers. There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition "B" grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition "B". It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City's Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff's Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 61/2% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.”

Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe

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

that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

 ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

 ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco.
Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

 ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Max Woods
Republican State Committee
State Assembly Candidate
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner
John Moy
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Congressional Candidate
Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committee
Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committee
Dennis Mark
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee
Candidate
Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee
Lisa Kloth
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

 ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman
Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committee
Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee
JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeewoman

 ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O'Keefe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE."
**PROPOSITION C**

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

**How Supervisors Voted on “C”**

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Carol Ruth Silver, and Nancy Walker.

**NO:** Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

**Controller’s Statement on “C”**

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year."

**USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (SEE INSERT)**

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35**
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent "on-the-front line" fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay "on-the-front line", and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition "C", a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre "TIME SERVED" proposal would raise each fireman's pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual "pay package" for a regular "entry rank" H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT,
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent "RAPID TURNOVER" problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter's Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition "C".

If passed, this "longevity of service" premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "C".

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.

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

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition “C” will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition “C” simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

1. For the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

2. For the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

3. For said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

4. Shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226
NO 227

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City's water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facili-

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231

NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F"

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!
San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of

(Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.
Please print your name clearly.
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer? YES 240 \ NO 241 \n
Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder's duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder's office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder's Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder's job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It's like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City's elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder's office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate "red tape", delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

Republican County Central Committee

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition "I". Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the "BIG PIE" at City Hall. Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote "YES".

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committe on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John Moy
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on "I" (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).


Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

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

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sara Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walter
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Casiano, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Muscone
Bob McDonald, Laborers Local 261
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 399
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

WE URGES YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elisabeth Anello
John Bardi, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleasby
Eric Craven
GwenCraig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Nove Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gele, member, John Muir Tenants*.
Jeff Greenender
Roma Guy, Co-Director, Women's Foundation*
John Holitzclaw, Chair, S.P. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jacks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kellner, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kainman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee*

Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
San Palomares-Criollos
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Pest, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Reit
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rovner
Tom Saunders
Sun Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "J" Woestie, CDL*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Mauris Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women's Forum*

Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "I".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert A. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O'Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Marylene A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Tee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

Identification purposes only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City's finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

- grow
- provide jobs
- raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblenz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraud
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city's best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表
June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor enviéme la balota por correo:

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

VOTANTE AUSENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente.

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter’s Initials

Descripción del Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Volante

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION

Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

Date
Deputy Registrar
FROM:

______________________________

______________________________

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?  
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN  
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,  
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1994  
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

申请缺席选票必须在选举日七日之前  
即五月二十九日星期二下午五时经由  
选民注册官办事处收到此申请表格。

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA  
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO  
DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 29 DE MAYO DE 1994,  
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA  
ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON  
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS  
155 CITY HALL  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Make Your Vote Truly Count—Support The Republican Party!

Your vote is critical — but it is just one vote!

Why not make it multiply (and help your candidates win) by sending a few dollars now to the Republican Party's Victory Fund and/or volunteer a few hours of your time as we head into the November elections?

In addition to Ronald Reagan, every Republican candidate who wins in the June primary will depend heavily on us to provide the campaign services and resources they need for victory. Send us $15 or $20 now, and we'll have the funds on hand to pay for advertising, polling and get-out-the-vote mailings, and statewide organization.

Your check now means we can reach hundreds more voters, just as we have reached you. Won't you please help? Lift this flap now and show your support for the entire Republican team!
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hom
Richard Cerbatos, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louisa Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yuri Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can't afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community's interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carolina Fisler del Puerto, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Obregon
Al Borice, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zuretti L. Gooby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Soloni Wilton, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I. The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $25,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K
Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller's Statement on "K"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: "Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time."

How "K" Got on Ballot
On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

· Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans

Amy Meyer
Keith Eckman
Tommy Harris
Frances McKee
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Ynegas
Tom Malloy, General Manager

Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Carl Pope
Miriam Blumenthal
Joyce Hall
Don Horonzy
Robert Muchilbauer
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Holsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Willinda McCrea
William Kuhns
Margaret Brennan
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Bulkeley
Ella Cahn

Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lew
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rafal

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPayers ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEman.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote "NO" on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

lems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

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 A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter sections 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank", as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annuity compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance:

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “fireman” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator’s as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), 2 and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy pur-
poses; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the com-
mission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.306, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
proposition, principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds herefore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, and for such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to the mayor for such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the register of voters and to occupy the offices of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefore to be fixed in accordance with the salary-standardization provisions of this chapter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said office on said 8th day of January 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o’clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o’clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o’clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
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Analysis  42
Arguments  43
Legal Text  62, 63

PROPOSITION I
Would reduce the number of Supervisors from 11 to 7 and would change supervisory elections to odd-numbered years.
Analysis  44
Arguments  45-50
Legal Text  50, 63

PROPOSITION J
Would allow the City to charge prisoners for the cost of jail, if they can afford to pay.
Analysis  51
Arguments  52, 53
Legal Text  53

PROPOSITION K
With exceptions, would regulate the construction of buildings that cast shadows on parks & playgrounds.
Analysis  54
Arguments  55-58
Legal Text  63
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to
    vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. citizen,
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day,
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the
     conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what
    political party you consider yours, you can say “In-
    dependent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to
    vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this
    election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County
    Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and
    address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back
    cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting
    place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you.
    If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your vot-
    ing place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth
    even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in
    voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the
    ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t
    know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll
    workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls
    on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and
     voting there
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’
     handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an
    absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to
    the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • your address when you signed up to vote,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name
     underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Reg-
    istrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Reg-
    istrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your
    absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M.
    on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING
CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"With so much voter apathy, I like to think of it as getting out the vote..."

(Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.)

Fortunately, the type of activity depicted above rarely occurs in California elections. To help keep it that way, please report to the Registrar, in writing, any unlawful election activity you may be aware of.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

A 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機器將選票選票插入。

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 cabechitas rojas.

C 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.

D 第三步
請著銘選票選票，由小孔內當直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
Punch out ballot card only with punching device attached to vote recorder; never with pen or pencil.

Instructions to Voters:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate’s name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person’s name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the “YES” or after the word “NO”.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

Perfore la Tarea de Voto Unicamente con El Picador Atado en la Cuerda al Registrador; No Use Pluma Ni Lápiz.

Instrucciones a Los Votantes:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfore la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra “SI” o después de la palabra “NO”.

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票票簿上的打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

選民選票所選的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩名或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔，但不要超過要選舉的候選人數。

選民必須的非候選的候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供的處於選票上選票所選侯選人選票所選的職位和候選人的姓名。

選民投票時，請在選票上箭頭所指“YES”或“NO”字樣打孔。

選票上有選票信封或選票套，選票只能作選票。

如果你在選票上打孔錯誤，撕破或損壞了，撕破了非候選候選人的選票信封，應把該選票退回給選票的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress—5th District</td>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH Retired Navy Nurse Enfermera de la Marina Jubilada</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE GARZA Businessman Hombre de Negocios 商人</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA Public Accountant Contador público 公共會計師</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator—3rd Senatorial District</td>
<td>MILTON MARKS State Senator Senador Estatal 州参议员</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly—17th Assembly District</td>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON County Central Committeeperson Miembro, Comité Central del Condado 县中央委员</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON College Teacher Maestro de Universidad 大学教员</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
17th DISTRICT

**MIEMBRO, COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL CONDADO — DISTRITO #17**

Vote for no more than 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDIE WALLACE</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN BENJAMIN MOY</td>
<td>Attorney-Investor/Abogado</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
<td>Accountant/Contador</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER G. BAKOS</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultor</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FERDINAND TERHEYDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON</td>
<td>College Teacher/Profesor Universitario</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.F. O'KEEFFE, SR.</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. LESTER O'SHEA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHY HENDERSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. SIMPSON</td>
<td>Financial Services Representative</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL SHER</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE PAYNE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE J. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>Attorney at law/Abogado</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLPH ANDREWS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. DEREK ANDERSON</td>
<td>Chairman, President, Stockbroker</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>Retired Navy Nurse/Enfermera</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPUBLICAN PARTY**

**ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA 5 DE JUNIO DE 1994**

**COMITÉ DEL CONDADO**

**COUNTY COMMITTEE**

**JUNE 5, 1994**

2R(17)
## JUDICIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Number One</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>158 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160 ➡️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.

| Yes | 163 ➡️ |
| No  | 164 ➡️ |

#### 17. NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984.
This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.

| Yes | 167 ➡️ |
| No  | 168 ➡️ |

This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.

| Yes | 171 ➡️ |
| No  | 172 ➡️ |

This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.

| Yes | 175 ➡️ |
| No  | 176 ➡️ |

### ELECTED OFFICIALS.
Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate’s defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.

<p>| Yes | 180 ➡️ |
| No  | 181 ➡️ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>VOTO</th>
<th>DESCRIPCIÓN</th>
<th>DETALLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLO DE CAPITAL PARA CÁRCEL DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárcel de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
<td>一九八四年縣監獄建費公債法案，這個法案規定發行公債$250,000,000，用作興建、重建、改建和更新縣監獄，以及延遲維持等費用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
<td>一九八四年监狱新监狱公債法案，這個法案規定發行公債$300,000,000，用作興建、重建、裝修、以及延遲維持等費用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la específica adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, plazas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
<td>一九八四年加州公園及康樂設施法案，這個法案規定發行公債$370,000,000，用作指定的購買、發展、恢復及修繕實業，以作公園、海灘、康樂或歷史保存等用途。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
<td>一九八四年魚類與野生動物生長地帶改進法案，這個法案規定發行公債$85,000,000，用作撥款給野生動物保護局及州海岸保護局，作指定的購買、改進及發展生長地帶之用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Desclassificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador se desclasiifica, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
<td>民選官員，凡發表誹謗性或造謠性競選言論，因而擊敗競選對手者，其資格予以取消，財政影響，無直接財政影響。如一候選的候選人被取消資格，地方政府必須進行一次選舉以填補空缺，則可能須負擔額外選舉開支。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185    NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190    NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196    NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204    NO 205
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Coment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.**
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los háberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto depende de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alto o más bajo debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

**PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESPECIAL CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.** Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de directores del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

**IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD, EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS.** Exime de revaluación para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida de réditos. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades bienales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

**LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN.** Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición paritaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por 237 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

**COMUNIDAD.** Operaciones de créditos pendientes. Declaran los créditos pendientes como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto depende de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alto o más bajo debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

**PUBLICIDAD.** Operaciones de créditos pendientes. Declaran los créditos pendientes como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto depende de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alto o más bajo debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

**PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESPECIAL CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.** Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de directores del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

**IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD, EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS.** Exime de revaluación para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida de réditos. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades bienales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

**LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN.** Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición paritaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por 237 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
**A** Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

**B** Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

**C** Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221
NO 222

**E** Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226
NO 227

**F** Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232
¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgar a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los provistos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

A

212 SI 贷成

213 NO 反对

¿Deberá pagarle a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 p.m. y las 7:00 p.m. en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

B

216 SI 贷成

217 NO 反对

¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactoriamente recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%?, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C

221 SI 贷成

222 NO 反对

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E

226 SI 贷成

227 NO 反对

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

F

231 SI 贷成

232 NO 反对
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!

"Nothing could be more important to the future of our nation than your support for the Republican Party. Our ability to elect more Republicans to office in November depends on your help now.

Elections aren't won on Election Day—they are won in the months before, when Republicans join together to build a strong organization. Your support for the California Republican Party is critically needed. Please, join us today."

— Ronald Reagan
REPUBLICAN PARTY 1984 VICTORY FUND

From: ____________________________  NAME
______________________________
ADDRESS
______________________________
CITY
______________________________
STATE   ZIP CODE

I want to help the Republican Party win a major victory this year!

☐ Here's my personal check for the Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund. I'm sending:

☐ $15  ☐ $25  ☐ $50  ☐ $100  ☐ Other ___________________

(Please make check payable to: Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund)

☐ I want to volunteer my time. My telephone # is ( )__________________

OCCUPATION (REQUIRED BY LAW)

OFFICIAL SIGNATURE

Please return this form with your contribution. Many thanks.
Paid for by the California Republican Party.

Please detach the form above, fill it out, and return it with your donation!
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.**</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16: 163, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17: 167, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18: 171, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18: 175, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21: 185, 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22: 190, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Committee*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23: 195, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24: 204, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: 212, 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: 216, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: 211, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: 226, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E: 231, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F: 236, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G: 240, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: 244, 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: 249, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: 253, 254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

("Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.")

Muni Court Judge 1.

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

236 SI 買成
237 NO 反對

¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

240 SI 買成
241 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

244 SI 買成
245 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

249 SI 買成
250 NO 反對

¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

253 SI 買成
254 NO 反對

¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedad del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN MCCURDY
My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.
My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller's Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance.

This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION "A" is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION "A" will keep San Francisco's best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it's harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America's best-run cities.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City. Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let's hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

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

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

San Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Caden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sedonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatas
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Denverin
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopp
Member, Board of Education

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits.

Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government.

Vote yes on Proposition A.

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehousemen’s Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?
Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.
All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.
San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.
Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.
Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaynes
Granveld A. Jackson
Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes
Mattie Scott
Martha Simmons
Forrest Pritchett
Gloria Johnson
Matilda Whetsone
Mildred Sorrells
Ben Johnson
Bea Stoneham
Jance Reynolds
Constance Rodgers
Tommie Steele Jr.
Rhonda Darrett
Robert B. Johnson Jr.
Gregory E. Fields
Gwendolyn Thibodeaux
Juana Francis
Albert R. Carter
Annie Y. Bradford
Anthony Wagner
Beatrice Brown
Eliska Melheyr
Garrett Smith
Lenna Meacham
Madison J. Bland
Reverend Johnnie Robinson
Arthur Kellough
Mary Ellen W. Garr
Aubrey V. Jackques
Rufus Cann
Dorothy V. Kelsey
Anna Dall Taylor
William Bailey
Gloria Duke
Lynnette Haymes
Arthur W. Rose
Dorothy Elliot

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.
It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Marie O'Brien
Virginia Lozada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg
Sally Raf
Amor Cruz
John Garb
Bryna Bailin
Lily Tsin
Eva Tan
Germaine Uribe
Pat Hoover
Lloyd C. Jackson
Nova Bevel
Brenda Barross
Jean Pechenino
Carolyn Davis
Laurie Smith
Mike Rijkin
Margaret Kahn
Janet L. Kollet, R. N.
Shoshana Silverman
Lorraine Anne Thiebaud
Evelyn Hannah
Bobbie Vancey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.
Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outdated, expensive practices or current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.
A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jaicks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus
Marie Jobling
Tess Rouveral
Ron Huberman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate. San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees. Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit. Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of govern-

ment, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspoken and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

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

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.
Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessy
Sheriff
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6 1/4% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote "YES" on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the "high crime" evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

"Night Differential" is as basic as "apple pie."
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
Police Night Pay

that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.

Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for
dangerous nightime duty.

Robert Silverari
Republican Central Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committee
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee
Former City Commissioner

John Moynihan
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Congressional Candidate

Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Doni Varmash
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Harry Herle
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

Lisa Klobuchar
Republican Central Committee
Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:

San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committee

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committee

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE.
Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

 Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits? 

YES 221
NO 222

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be: 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service, 5% over base pay after 15 years of service, 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent "on-the-front line" fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry . . . even other fire departments—grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay "on-the-front line", and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition "C", a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre "TIME SERVED" proposal would raise each fireman's pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual "pay package" for a regular "entry rank" H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial automatic pay increases again in July!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent "RAPID TURNOVER" problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter's Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition "C".

If passed, this "longevity of service" premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "C".

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.

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

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only—and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firefighters. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226
NO 227

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

The text of Proposition E begins on page 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “F” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “F” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236

NO 237

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet. Please print your name clearly.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place: Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall

Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

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

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don't be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition "I". Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the "BIG PIE" at City Hall. Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote "YES".

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

George Retumet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

We agree with the "PROGRESS" editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

Former City Commissioner

John Morris
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Shirley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on "I" (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Elect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinosa for Congress.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscans against San Franciscans. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition 1.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition 1.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

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

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hard-working Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Ciaccinato, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Mecomme
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390-400
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100
John Maler
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello  
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*  
Stafford Buckley  
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*  
Marie Cleary  
Eric Craven  
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.  
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*  
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals  
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*  
Jim Foster  
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*  
Jeff Greendorfer  
Roma Guy, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*  
John Holzclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*  
Agar Jakes  
David and Edith Jenkins  
Marie Jobling  
Rodney Johnson  
Joseph Kellihra, S.F. Tenants Union*  
Tony Kiley, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*  
Margot Kaufman  
Steven M. Kreffling, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters  
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*  
Toby Levine  
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*  
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*  
Stan Palomoares-Criollo  
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*  
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*  
Linda Peet, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*  
George M. Rayo  
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*  
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*  
Tessa Rouvelo  
Tom Saunders  
Stan Shields  
Marion Sills  
Arthur Simon  
Peter Stern  
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*  
Mary Vail  
Dana Van Gorder  
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*  
Esther “B” Woeste, CLU*  
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*  
Maura Keating  
Denise A. Antenore  
Betel Wallace-Landa, Democratic Women’s Forum*  
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*  
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein  
William Coben  
Jerome Adams  
Timothy Tosta  
Louis Giraud  
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have
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申请人邮寄一份缺席選票給本人，以参加上述所示之選舉。

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
Prec. No.____________________
Ballot No.__________________
Ballot Mailed________________
Inspector’s Notice____________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:____________
__________________________
Date
Deputy Registrar

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA- 正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申请人签名

DATE-FECHA- 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION-住址:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor enviéme la balota
por correo:

请將選票寄給本人下址

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter, in accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter’s Initials

VOTANTEAUSENTE
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JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
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Make Your Vote Truly Count—Support The Republican Party!

Your vote is critical — but it is just one vote!
Why not make it multiply (and help your candidates win) by sending a few dollars now to the Republican Party’s Victory Fund and/or volunteer a few hours of your time as we head into the November elections?

In addition to Ronald Reagan, every Republican candidate who wins in the June primary will depend heavily on us to provide the campaign services and resources they need for victory. Send us $15 or $20 now, and we’ll have the funds on hand to pay for advertising, polling and get-out-the-vote mailings, and statewide organization.

Your check now means we can reach hundreds more voters, just as we have reached you. Won’t you please help? Lift this flap now and show your support for the entire Republican team!
The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods’ small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hor
Richard Corbato, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Moshi, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jes Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION II

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carloota Tejador del Portillo, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Obregom
Al Borvice, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zuretti L. Goody, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sedumia Wiltam, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum
We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I. The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose—to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups—women, minorities, and gays—will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”
Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven nine members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in fourth every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 they shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
Jail Cost Reimbursement

PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can't be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It's only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they're convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition "K".

Support Proposition "K".

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition "J" to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition "K". Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical “common sense” politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keefe, Sr. President.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.

REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Hale
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul A. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on “K”.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association, for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women’s Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K”.  

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays, but Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-

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

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.
(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.
(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation variable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining the amount of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The amount of such reward shall be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount of pay to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year. Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such living benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police department and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items in the cities included in the statement report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods therefore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases in the indexes. In computing the increase or decrease in the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time the said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no

uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.

Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereeto- fore or hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy pur- poses; (5) reconstruction and replacement of such commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed the rate which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
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principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.306, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to him the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the power and perform the duties of the register of voters and to occupy the office of register of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefor to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981; shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said office on said 8th day of January 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall begin as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983; and at the general election in 1984, four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1984; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the power and perform the duties of the register of voters and to occupy the office of register of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefor to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

the respective terms of office of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Hist-
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POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are a U.S. citizen.
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

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

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can't help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in." If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters' handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • your address when you signed up to vote,
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed,
   • then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—if you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"With so much voter apathy, I like to think of it as getting out the vote..."
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

A 第一步
请双手持票向自动机牌插盖选票插入。

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 cabezales rojas.

B 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，应合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

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

D 第三步
请把带锥之选票由小孔向票面插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobres.

E 第四步
投票选投票之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格预备为投票人应用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORAR LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por el candidato de su selección, perforar la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando hayan dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforar la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta a los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforar la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "Sí" o después de la palabra "No".

Todas las marcas o borradas están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estrapea la balota, o rompe o estrapea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinct y obtenga otra.

請在下頁開始投票

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
### Presidential Preference

**Preferencia Presidencial**

**Ronald Reagan**

Representative in Congress—5th District

**Representante de Congreso — Distrito #5**

**Anna M. Guth**
- Retired Navy Nurse
- Enfermera de la Marina Jubilada

**Mike Garza**
- Businessman
- Hombre de Negocios

**Tom Spinosa**
- Public Accountant
- Contador Público

(There is no contest for State Senator in this District)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.)

**Member of the Assembly—17th Assembly District**

**Miembro de la Asamblea — Distrito #17**

**Donald Donaldson**
- County Central Committeeperson
- Miembro, Comité Central del Condado

**Lee S. Dolson**
- College Teacher
- Maestro de Universidad
**MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE**

**17th DISTRICT**

**MIEMBRO, COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL CONDADO — DISTRITO #17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDIE WALLACE</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman/Mujer Miembro del Comité Central Estatal</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN BENJAMIN MOY</td>
<td>Attorney-Investor/Abogado-Inversionista</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
<td>Accountant/Contador/ 會計師</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER G. RAKOS</td>
<td>Consultant/Consultor/ 顧問</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FERDINAND TERHEYDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 現任委員</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 現任委員</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON</td>
<td>College Teacher/Profesor Universitario/ 大學教員</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.E. O’KEEFE, SR.</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 現任委員</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. LESTER O'SHEA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 現任委員</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHY HENDERSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 現任委員</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. SIMPSON</td>
<td>Financial Services Representative/Representante de Servicios Financieros/ 財政服務代表</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL SHER</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado/ 律師</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE PAYNE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 現任委員</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE J. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>Attorney at law/Abogado/ 律師</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLPH ANDREWS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo/ 現任委員</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. DEREK ANDERSON</td>
<td>Chairman, President, Stockbroker/Presidente, Bolsista/ 管事長、總裁、股票經紀</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>Retired Navy Nurse/Enfermera Jubilada de la Marina/ 退休海軍護士</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NONPARTISAN BALLOT

### JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judicial</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>ELECTED OFFICIALS.</strong> Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Autor</th>
<th>Resolución</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163 SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CÁRCELES DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárceles de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
<td>ALBERT, C. WOLLENBERG, JR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
<td>JONATHAN McCURDY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la especificada adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 SI</td>
<td>FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed. YES 185  NO 186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs. YES 190  NO 191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions. YES 196  NO 197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding. YES 204  NO 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara las haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Específica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a un tasa más alto o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de directores del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD, EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCION PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del reavalúo para el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades binales de las comunidades, y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a una menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición paritaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sosténimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgar a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los previstos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía.

B. Deberá pagárseles a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación.

C. Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación.

E. Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de Ingresos de Hetch Hetch para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones.

F. Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de Ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones.
**NONPARTISAN BALLOT**

**CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

**G**
Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?  
YES 236  NO 237

**H**
Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?  
YES 240  NO 241

**I**
Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?  
YES 244  NO 245

**J**
Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?  
YES 249  NO 250

**K**
Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?  
YES 253  NO 254
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!

"Nothing could be more important to the future of our nation than your support for the Republican Party. Our ability to elect more Republicans to office in November depends on your help now.

Elections aren’t won on Election Day—they are won in the months before, when Republicans join together to build a strong organization. Your support for the California Republican Party is critically needed. Please, join us today.”

— Ronald Reagan
From: ____________________________

NAME

______________________________

ADDRESS

______________________________

CITY

______________________________

STATE ZIP CODE

I want to help the Republican Party win a major victory this year!

☐ Here's my personal check for the Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund. I'm sending:

☐ $15 ☐ $25 ☐ $50 ☐ $100 ☐ Other ____________

(Please make check payable to: Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund)

☐ I want to volunteer my time. My telephone #

is ( )__________________________

OCCUPATION (REQUIRED BY LAW)

OFFICIAL SIGNATURE

Please return this form with your contribution. Many thanks.
Paid for by the California Republican Party.

Please detach the form above, fill it out, and return it with your donation!
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984
TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pam-
phlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT
WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your
choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will
make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to
wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes”
or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

## CANDIDATES

### President
1 or 8.**

(**Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presentional candidate)**

### U.S. Congress Representative
1. 

### State Senator (if applicable)
1. 

### State Assembly
1. 

### County Committee*
1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5. *  
6. *  
7. *  
8. *  
9. *  
10. *

(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)

### Muni Court Judge
1. 

## STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G
¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H
¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I
¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J
¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado o otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K
¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
# VOTER SELECTION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presentional candidate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Congress Representative</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Senator (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Assembly</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.*</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.*

**Muni Court Judge**

1. ____________________________

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G  ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H  ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registrop con la Oficina del Registrador de Volantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I  ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J  ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K  ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?

L  ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

M  ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registrop con la Oficina del Registrador de Volantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

N  ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiar de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

O  ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

P  ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212

NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.
3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let's make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco's growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION "A" will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION "A", we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION "A", our loss will be these cities' and counties' gain.

Take stock in San Francisco's future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers' money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family, health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION "A" is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION "A" will keep San Francisco's best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A".

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it's harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America's best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION "A"!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let's hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception: To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sodania Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbatis
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Denehein
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kopf
Member, Board of Education

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

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission
Honorabke Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission
Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board
Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits. Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, Raoul Wallenberg Democratic Club
George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club
David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee
Joanne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party
Jim Wochab
President, District 8 Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club
Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council
Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council
LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition a will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it's fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane Mckaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitation Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Patch
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Philhower
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Vidnov
Proprietor, Oceanside Hardware

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church

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

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women's Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaymes
Grandvel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Maria O'Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jacks
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tessa Rouveral
Ron Huherman

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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote "NO" on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor 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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecified and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

Finally, by placing the responsibility for the negotiator with the Board of Supervisors, this measure establishes a potentially dangerous relationship between the Board and City workers. There are 25,000 City employees who if unified could form a powerful voting block. This could significantly influence any instructions the Board of Supervisors give to their negotiator when dealing with City employees. Proposition A increases the possibility of either higher costs or public employee strikes.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City's voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

This potentially catastrophic proposal puts the Board back into the business of annually negotiating individual labor contracts with each and every union. Millions of your tax dollars are at stake! VOTE NO!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960's by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won't have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor's statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can't stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let's not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216

NO 217

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition “B” will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition “B” would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition “B” grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition “B”. It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your “YES” vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City’s Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff’s Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, “night differential” certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6/4% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

   This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

   Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

   One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

   Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

   Al Nelder
   David Sanchez
   Jo Daly
   Burl Toler
   Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

   VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

   Jane McKaskle Murphy
   Former Police Commissioner
   Arlo Smith
   District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

   I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

   Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.”
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
that our police officers should *definitely* receive it as well.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!**

San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority: length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran  
State Senator — 8th District

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**YES ON PROPOSITION B**

Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and *good government*. Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casciato, President  
San Francisco Police Officers' Asstn.

Don Scott  
Former Chief of Police

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:**

Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri  
Republican Central Committeeman  
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods  
Republican State Committeeman  
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Former City Commissioner

John Moy  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Candidate

Tom Spinosa  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Congressional Candidate

Leslie Payne  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Candidate

Stanley Braunwell  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Candidate

Dennis Mark  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Candidate

Shirley Spinosa  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Candidate

Harry Herpe  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Candidate

Kevin Sullivan  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Candidate

Lisa Kloehnkar  
Republican Central Committeeman  
Candidate

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:**

San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith  
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith  
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary  
Democratic Central Committeeman

Patrick Fitzgerald  
Democratic Central Committeeman

JoAnne Miller  
Democratic Central Committeewoman

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B**

The concept of “NIGHT PREMIUM PAY” for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.  
PRESIDENT.  
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.  
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.
Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221

NO 222

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:

- 2½% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7½% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller's Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent "on-the-front line" fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay "on-the-front line", and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition "C", a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to fire fighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced fire fighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two fire fighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre "TIME SERVED" proposal would raise each fireman's pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual "pay package" for a regular "entry rank" H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O'Keefe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent "RAPID TURNOVER" problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter's Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition "C".

If passed, this "longevity of service" premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "C":
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply is a means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don't clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco's firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the "problem" alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSEDCharter Amendment PROPOSITION C

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3.531 of this chapter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;
(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;
(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226
NO 227

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.
6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F"

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifyable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to ap-

prove or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROP 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operations and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of (Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application

is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees' Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES  240

NO   241

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

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

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked or approved by any official agency.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244 □
NO 245 □

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.
Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.
Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate
George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committeee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate
Robert Guichard
Businessman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner
John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Stanley Bramwell
Republican Central Committeeman
Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate
Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).


Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscan against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Additionally, Proposition “I” would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Proposition “I” would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition “I”.

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

NO ON PROP I

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hardworking Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswomen Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al. Casteto, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261*
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 390/400*
Louise Ogden, President, SF National Women’s Political Caucus*
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100*
John Maher
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I. I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.

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

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleary
Eric Craven
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sanja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendefer
Roma Guy, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holtzclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jacks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Jobling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kelliber, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*
Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Palomar-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Raya
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rouxel
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "b" Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Mauri Kealey
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bonci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members - best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Madeline A. Casey, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Blyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*
*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblentz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Girundo
Henry Berman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表
June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot: Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at: Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申請人簽名
DATE-FECHA- 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCIÓN- 住址:

Please mail ballot to me at:

Mailing address, if different from above

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION? (¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 29 DE MAYO DE 1984, EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Make Your Vote **Truly** Count—Support The Republican Party!

Your vote is critical – but it is just one vote!

Why not make it multiply (and help your candidates win) by sending a few dollars now to the Republican Party’s Victory Fund and/or volunteer a few hours of your time as we head into the November elections?

In addition to Ronald Reagan, every Republican candidate who wins in the June primary will depend heavily on us to provide the campaign services and resources they need for victory. Send us $15 or $20 now, and we’ll have the funds on hand to pay for advertising, polling and get-out-the-vote mailings, and statewide organization.

Your check now means we can reach hundreds more voters, just as we have reached you. Won’t you please help? Lift this flap now and show your support for the entire Republican team!
San Francisco, California 94102
49 Geary Street #240
Republican Party of San Francisco County
Victory 84

Postage will be paid by addressee

Permit No. 9652
San Francisco, CA
Business Reply Mail

Thousands of dollars in postage
will help save the party your 20c stamp

United States
In The
Mail

Necessary
No Postage

1984 Victory Fund
The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its work without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods’ small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Terry Pimsleur, Terry Pimsleur and Company
Aileen C. Hernandez, Aileen C. Hernandez Associates
Fred Ateyeh, President, Independent Grocers Association*
Walter G. Jebe, Jebe’s Kompact Kameras
Dana Walsh, President, Greater Clement Street Merchants Association*

*Organization listed for identification purposes only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which affect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Winton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zuretti L. Goodby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Sodonia Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP “I”

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven nine members elected at large. At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisioral election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisioral election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisor shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn't have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it's working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let's put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they're able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn't result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can't afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco's Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can't be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It's only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they're convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.
PROPOSITION K

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller's Statement on “K”

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

"Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time."

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Support Proposition “K”.

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!

A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Parks Commission
Eugene E. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”

San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

William McCrea
William Kubus
Margarete Brown
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Budley
Ella Cohn
Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Law
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rafal

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans

Amy Meyer
Keith Eckman
Tommy Harris
Frances McAtee
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Yuengay
Tom Malloy, General Manager

Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hunicutt
Carol Negro
Arden Danekes
Heide Chipp
Tim Lillyquist
Dick Grosholl
John Holtzclaw

Don Sweeney
Jack Trojillo
Jane Winslow
Lennie Lawson

Carl Pope
Miriam Blaustein
Joyce Hall
Don Horany
Robert Machilbauer
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Boniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tatro
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bysiek
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants' Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feeser
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merzchel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city's parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let's approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It's entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let's do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco's many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote "NO" on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

Problems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON "K"

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

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 A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said member to have his time reduced proportionately, or may cause him to receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgment of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting; and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation variable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, or any permitted absence for any type whatever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosenmen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to sections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.

Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.
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ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute a lien on the property and shall not be a debt of the city and county and shall not be chargeable against the property and shall not be chargeable against or in any way chargeable against the property of the city and county.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and Interest on general obligation bonds heretofore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (c).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as is read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that

the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension management, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the board, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties

The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief ad-

ministrative officer, to prescribe general rules and regulations for the administrative service under his control; to have a voice but no vote in the board of supervisors, with the right to report on or to discuss any matter before the said board concerning the affairs of the departments in his charge; to make such recommendations and propose such measures to the mayor, the board of supervisors, or committees thereof, concerning the affairs of the city and county in his charge as he may deem necessary; to coordinate the functioning of the several departments of the city and county charged with powers and duties relating to control of traffic; and to provide for the budgeting and control of publicity and advertising expenditures of the city and county.

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983. At the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

- Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:
  No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are a U.S. citizen.
- are at least 18 years of age on election day.
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- your address when you signed up to vote,
- the address where you want the ballot mailed,
- then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"WITH SO MUCH VOTER APATHY, I LIKE TO THINK OF IT AS GETTING OUT THE VOTE..."

(Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.)

Fortunately, the type of activity depicted above rarely occurs in California elections. To help keep it that way, please report to the Registrar, in writing, any unlawful election activity you may be aware of.
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, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动機將整張選票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

C 第二步
請記者將選票插入時，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.

D 第三步
请把帶鋒之選舉針，由小孔內順直插入行孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格請備為投票人應用。

6
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TAREA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請在投票紀錄器上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

投票時所選擇的任何其他候選人，選在選票上所指示之候選人姓名打孔。如果有兩個或以上
候選人競選同一職位，選在選票上所指示之所有候選人中，選擇你要投票的候選人打孔。但不
要超過要選舉的固定數數。

如投票時所選擇的非候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供之預定空白上屬下數候選人
所選選的職位和候選人姓名。

選票任何摺疊，選在選票上所指示 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有圖書插貼或紙張，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔損了，或摺損或弄髒了，或撕損了非候選候選人的選票信封，應
把該選票懸掛於選舉員，另發取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PRÓXIMA PÁGINA
# Presidential Preference

Vota por Uno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferencia Presidencial</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Representative in Congress—5th District

Diputado al Congreso — Distrito #5

Vota por Uno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIKE GARZA</th>
<th>112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businessman Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOM SPINOSA</th>
<th>114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Accountant Contador Público</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNA M. GUTH</th>
<th>116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired Navy Nurse Enfermera de la Marina Jubilada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# State Senator—3rd Senatorial District

Senador Estatal, Distrito #3

Vota por Uno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILTON MARKS</th>
<th>121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Senator Senador Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Member of the Assembly—19th Assembly District

Miembro de la Asamblea — Distrito #19

Vota por Uno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROBERT R. BACCI</th>
<th>127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney-at-Law Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROBERT SILVESTRI</th>
<th>129</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Central Committeeman Miembro, Comité Central del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1R(19-3-5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terence Faulkner</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Bacci</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas K. Blean</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred &quot;Millie&quot; Danch</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Vukasich</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Klobucar</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita G. Raven</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Herpe</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin John Sullivan</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Silvestri</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Election Primaria 5 de Junio de 1984*

*Republican Party*

*County Committee*

*Member, County Central Committee 19th District*

*Miembro, Comité Central Del Condado — Distrito #19*

*Vote for no more than 5*
**JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT**
Office Number One  
Vote for One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDICIAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR  
Judge of Municipal Court | 158 → |
| JONATHAN McCURDY  
Tenant Attorney | 160 → |

**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.</td>
<td>163 →</td>
<td>164 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.</td>
<td>167 →</td>
<td>168 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.</td>
<td>171 →</td>
<td>172 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.</td>
<td>175 →</td>
<td>176 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>ELECTED OFFICIALS.</strong> Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate's defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.</td>
<td>180 →</td>
<td>181 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Núm.</td>
<td>SI/NO</td>
<td>Descripción</td>
<td>Resumen en inglés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 158  | ALBERT, C. WOLLENBERG, JR  
Juez de la Corte Municipal  
地方法院法官 | ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CÁRCELES DE CONDADO DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reemplazo de cárceles de condado y la ejecución de mantenimiento aplazado de las mismas conforme a una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.  
一九八四年縣監獄基建費公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債$250,000,000，用作興建、重建、改裝和更換監獄設備，以及遲延維持等費用。 |  |
| 160  | JONATHAN McCURDY  
Abogado Defensor de Inquilinos  
住客律師 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PREVISIONES DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelaje y mantenimiento aplazado de las instalaciones correccionales del estado conforme a una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.  
一九八四建築新監獄公債法案。這個提案規定發行公債$300,000,000，用作興建、重建、裝修、以及遲延維持等費用。 |  |
| 163  | SI  
贊成 | ACTA DE PARQUE E INSTALACIONES DE RECREACIÓN DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone la emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la específica adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.  
一九八四年加州公園及康樂設施法案。這個法案規定發行公債$370,000,000，用作購買，發展，恢復及修復實業，以作公園，海灘，康樂或歷史保存等用途。 |  |
| 164  | NO  
反對 |  |  |
| 171  | SI  
贊成 | ACTA DE ENGRANDECIMIENTO DE LOS RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y DEL ÁMBITO NATURAL DE VIDA SILVESTRE DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engrandecimiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.  
一九八四年魚類與野生動物生長地帶改進法案。  
這個法案規定發行公債$85,000,000，用作撥款給野生動物保護局及州海岸保護局，作指定的購買、改進及發展生長地帶之用。 |  |
| 172  | NO  
反對 |  |  |
| 175  | SI  
贊成 | FUNCIONARIOS ELEGIDOS. Descalificación cuando se han efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o caluniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato opONENTE. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrán incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.  
民選官員，凡發表誹謗性或造謠性競選言論，因而擊敗競選對手者，其資格予以取消。財政影響，無直接財政影響。如一候選的候選人被取消資格，地方政若必須進行一次選舉以填充補空缺，則可能需負額外選舉開支。 |  |
| 176  | NO  
反對 |  |  |
| 180  | SI  
贊成 |  |  |
| 181  | NO  
反對 |  |  |
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES 185
NO 186

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES 190
NO 191

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 196
NO 197

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES 204
NO 205
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS.
Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara los haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependerá de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alta o más baja debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL EMENDADA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de director del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. EMENDADA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Excluye del recaudado el impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones propuestas de seguridad contra sísmos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumento desconocido de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades binales de las comunidades y posiblemente otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición partidaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serán reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite tope se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.

Público en el estudio, análisis y formulación, se propone eliminar los efectos directos de la ley. Se declara el interés de los obstáculos que se encontrarán en el proceso de implementación, incluyendo la coordinación de los recursos humanos y financieros, la formación de la población, la conformación de políticas públicas e identificación de las necesidades de la población. Se requiere la creación de un programa integral de educación, formación y sensibilización dirigida a la población en general para promover el uso consciente y eficiente de los recursos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 212</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 216</td>
<td>NO 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2½% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7½%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 221</td>
<td>NO 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES 231</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgarles a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales que provisten a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B. ¿Deberá pagárseles a los oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 en punto p.m. y las 7:00 en punto a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C. ¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactorio recibir compensación del 2 1/2% adicional, después de quince años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitarse la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
G
Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

H
Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240
NO 241

I
Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

J
Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249
NO 250

K
Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

YES 253
NO 254
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!

"Nothing could be more important to the future of our nation than your support for the Republican Party. Our ability to elect more Republicans to office in November depends on your help now.

Elections aren’t won on Election Day—they are won in the months before, when Republicans join together to build a strong organization. Your support for the California Republican Party is critically needed. Please, join us today."

— Ronald Reagan
I want to help the Republican Party win a major victory this year!

( ) Here's my personal check for the Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund. I'm sending:

☐ $15  ☐ $25  ☐ $50  ☐ $100  ☐ Other ____________

(Please make check payable to: Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund)

( ) I want to volunteer my time. My telephone # is _________

Please return this form with your contribution. Many thanks.
Paid for by the California Republican Party.

Please detach the form above, fill it out, and return it with your donation!
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.

(over)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presential candidate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Congress Representative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Senator (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muni Court Judge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G. ¿Deberá el Secretario-Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

236 SI 賛成
237 NO 反對

H. ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registrador con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

240 SI 賛成
241 NO 反對

I. ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

244 SI 賛成
245 NO 反對

J. ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

249 SI 賛成
250 NO 反對

K. ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?

253 SI 賛成
254 NO 反對
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.

2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.

3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance.
San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!
Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.
PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance. This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great! It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

San Francisco is one of America’s best-run cities. Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by defections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Caden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government. VOTE for PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sadonia Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Cerbin
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Doncheim
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kipf
Member, Board of Education

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission

Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission

Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Warren DeMerritt
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Berneck
President, Ranoul Wallenberg Democratic Club

George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club

David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee

JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party

Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club

Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club

Sal Rosselli, President

Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club

Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits. Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and losses to the tax-payers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency. but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?

Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.

Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaymes
Grandel A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.

It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luisa P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Martha O’Brien

Virginia Latzada
Cornellia Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.

Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outmoded, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agar Jacobs
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Tess Rosner
Ron Huberman
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sneed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of government, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspoken and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

William F. O’Keefe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

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

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition "B" will bring fairness and equity to the City's work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition "B" would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition "B" grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition "B". It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote Yes on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide incentives for senior police officers to take night shifts, where the bulk of dangerous and violent crimes occur.

Because shift assignments are determined by seniority, veteran officers have tended to select day work, leaving the evening and night shifts to younger and less-experienced officers. Consequently, a wasteful situation is created where the more-experienced officers handle the less-serious circumstances, and high-crime hours are staffed by younger policemen. Allowing a situation in which experienced personnel is not used properly is not fully responsible.

Paying a night differential is a proven and effective method of attracting experienced personnel to unpopular shifts. It is used in almost all industries and should be applied in this case to provide better protection to all of San Francisco.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City's Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, many do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers -- such as employees of the Sheriff's Department or Airport Police -- and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, but, there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B

If there ever was a time honored, widely accepted benefit for working people, "night differential" certainly qualifies.

Time away from family, friends and loved ones, regardless of the profession, has long been recognized as grounds for premium compensation.

Police officers have historically worked around the clock protecting lives and property while others sleep. Proposition B would finally see to it that they receive the same benefits as other night time employees.

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress
Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress
Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District
Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6½% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That’s why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential” is as basic as “apple pie.”
Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe
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Police Night Pay

that our police officers should definitely receive it as well. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Ernest "Chuck" Ayala

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
San Francisco's Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

John F. Foran
State Senator — 8th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON PROPOSITION B
Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco. Prop B is cost efficient and good government.
Vote Yes on Prop B.

Al Casiato, President
San Francisco Police Officers' Assn.

Don Scott
Former Chief of Police

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:
Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John Moy
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate

Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committeeman

Stanley Bramswell
Republican Central Committeeman

Dennis Mark
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committeeman

Lisa Klober
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:
San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

The concept of "NIGHT PREMIUM PAY" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman's annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.
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Firefighter Longevity Pay

PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221
NO 222

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2 1/2% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7 1/2% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry ... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain Uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commissioner President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial automatic pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keefe, Sr.
President.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association.
Republican County Committeeman.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

Vote NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., President.
Robert Guichard, Vice President.
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Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department’s annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

The argument that this amendment will encourage senior firefighters to stay with the Department is simply not true. Few firefighters quit the department prior to collecting a very liberal retirement allowance. What is true is that Proposition "C" will cost all of us over $500,000 a year and our fire protection will not improve one bit.

Proposition "C" simply means to obtain extra salary outside the formula contained in the City Charter. The Proposition grants a benefit to employees in one Department only — and only to one rank within that Department. Don’t clutter the Charter with such special interest legislation.

Vote NO on Proposition "C".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote No on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco’s firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior remuneration. If the “problem” alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments

(a) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the highest rates paid to each police officer or patrolman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in section 3,531 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certify by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
Hetch Hetchy Financing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.

(Continued on page 61)
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION F BEGINS ON PAGE 39

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM

38
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F"

Proposition "F" would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition "E", this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition "E" only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition "F" will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F".

Diéne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition "F".

Proposition "F" would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition "F" would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition "F" would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition "F" would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifiable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition "F" would remedy this without removing the people's power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition "F".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to ap-

prove or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the "Water Department Revenue Fund." All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer's official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of

(Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236
NO 237

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet. Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the *only* Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees' Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn't be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to replace the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don't weaken our city's merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let's keep these two positions under

Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed

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

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A **YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A **NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

**How Supervisors Voted on “H”**

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

None of the supervisors voted “No”.

**Controller’s Statement on “H”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62**

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder's duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters — where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder's office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder's Office.

Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate "red tape", delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION 1

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?

YES 244
NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I: “Should the proposed Initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987.”

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “T”.

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee

State Assembly Candidate

George Rehmet
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committee

State Assembly Candidate

Robert Guichard
Businessman

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committee

Former City Commissioner

John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Stanley Branwell
Republican Central Committee

Tom Spinosa
Republican Congressional Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “T” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Elect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinosa for Congress,

and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Forum President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscans against San Franciscan. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turn-out historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also locks in the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hardworking Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote “NO” on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco’s voters.

The people behind this proposition aren’t telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to making the Board of Supervisors smaller, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won’t be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won’t work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won’t make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can’t run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It’s time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
C. Al Caucias, President, S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.,
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gina Moscone
Bob McDonald, Laborers Local 261
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director, SEIU Local 399/400
Louise Ogden, President SF National Women’s Political Caucus
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter L. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1100
John Mahler
Sue Bierman, member, San Francisco Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member — San Francisco Police Department.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bardis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Safford Buehley
Robert Canning, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleasy
Eric Craven
Gwen Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs, *
Sonja Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Foye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Mair Tenants*
Jeff Greenholzer
Roma Gay, Co-Director, Women's Foundation*
John Holtclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Juices
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Joibling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kelliker, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kilroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Kefligon, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary's Housing Committee*
Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Stan Palomares-Crivillos
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Ray
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Roverol
Tom Saunders
Stan Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Adm. Assistant to Congressman Sula Burton*
Mary Vial
Dana Van Gorder
Calvin Welch - Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther "b" Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Mauna Keahe
Dennis A. Antenore
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women's Forum*

*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge
you to vote NO on Proposition "T".

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven,
membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representa-
tive of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop "T".

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O'Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Maudeline A. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
A. Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Commit-
tee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Bloyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*

*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our
businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representa-
tive government is essential to the continued economic health of
our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with ele-
en members — best serves economic and civic health. The
City's finances are sound. Our economy continues to:
• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board
of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote
NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Maurice Bernstein
William Coblenz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraud
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city's best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I.
Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representa-
tive and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I
would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would re-
duce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small busines-
ses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs
in City Hall.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:

Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Election Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos del artículo 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente:

Description of Disability
Voter's Initials

DATE:FECHA- 日期

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above
Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
Prec. No. ____________________
Ballot No. ____________________
Ballot Mailed: ____________________
Inspector's Notice: ____________________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

Date      Deputy Registrar

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED
FROM:


DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACIÓN?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR’S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Make Your Vote *Truly* Count—Support The Republican Party!

Your vote is critical – but it is just one vote!

Why not make it multiply (and help your candidates win) by sending a few dollars now to the Republican Party's Victory Fund and/or volunteer a few hours of your time as we head into the November elections?

In addition to Ronald Reagan, every Republican candidate who wins in the June primary will depend heavily on us to provide the campaign services and resources they need for victory. Send us $15 or $20 now, and we'll have the funds on hand to pay for advertising, polling and get-out-the-vote mailings, and statewide organization.

Your check now means we can reach hundreds more voters, just as we have reached you. Won't you please help? Lift this flap now and show your support for the entire Republican team!
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods’ small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Terry Pimsleur, Terry Pimsleur and Company
Aileen C. Hernandez, Aileen C. Hernandez Associates
Fred Ateyeh, President, Independent Grocers Association*
Walter G. Jee, Jee’s Kompact Kameras
Dana Walsh, President, Greater Clement Street Merchants Association*

*Organization listed for identification purposes only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wilton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zuretti L. Goosby, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. soda wins Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progressive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legislation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representation on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

1.100 Composition and Salary

The Board of supervisors shall consist of eleven-nine members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisory election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed (Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249

NO 250

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Maher, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madyline A. Case
Jail Cost Reimbursement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can’t be expected to go picking up tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It’s only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they’re convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant’s ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant’s financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.

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

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

How “K” Got on Ballot

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION K APPEARS ON PAGE 63
Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition "K". Support Proposition "K".

San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.

This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition "J" to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public's right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.

No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn. To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition "K". Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION K!

A "YES" vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City's green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.

The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco's Recreation and Park facilities are the "lungs" of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON "K"

San Francisco's Recreation and Park facilities are the "lungs" of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote "YES" on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Willinda McCrean
William Kahn
Margaret Brown
Phoebe H. Brown
Jonathan Bullock
Ella Cahn
Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lew
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rajah

Robert Crawford
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Duria
Rebecca Evans

Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Berman, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Negro
Walter Park
Veronica Hummicut
Carol Negro
Arden Donkas
Heide Chipp
Tim Lillypaitz
Dick Grossboll
John Holtzclaw

Carla Page
Miriam Blaustein
Joyce Hall
Don Horanzy
Robert Muehlfauther
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Robert Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical "common sense" politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let's save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO'S PARKS AND PLAY-GROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Halle
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center
Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Benavide Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn't go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on "K".

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

North Beach Neighbors
Russian Hill Neighbors
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network
Planning Association for Richmond
San Francisco League of Environmental Voters
Sierra Club
Democratic Women's Forum
Nob Hill Neighbors

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition "K".

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks, since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote "NO" on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formula.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let's do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Copp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The Downtown Plan's innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children's playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.

(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.

(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leave for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for base pay therefor for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earmable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the city or in any police department of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rates of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stalkers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the rank of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding citywide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.

Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

1. Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

2. Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

3. Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds heretofore issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reacquisition and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement, of new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds

(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the proviso of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds herefore or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.

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

(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of votes and to occupy the office of registrar of votes and recorder, receiving a single salary therefor to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this chapter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the first six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years, the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected; and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985; and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time from the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible, for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historic landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Office as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of Historic Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K
Application for absentee ballot appears next to Page 48

Application para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by May 7, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. citizen.
• are at least 18 years of age on election day.
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-2232

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell."

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature and County Committee.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, if there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 5, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see the enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your address when you signed up to vote,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 5, 1984.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—if you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"WITH SO MUCH VOTER APATHY, I LIKE TO THINK OF IT AS GETTING OUT THE VOTE..."

(Reprinted by permission of the *San Francisco Chronicle*.)

Fortunately, the type of activity depicted above rarely occurs in California elections. To help keep it that way, please report to the Registrar, in writing, any unlawful election activity you may be aware of.
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

Insert the Ballot Card All the Way into the Votomatic.

Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the "Votomatic."

A 第一步

請雙手將選票插入自動投票機選票插孔處。

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.

B 第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，契合於二紅點之上。

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.

D 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, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del distrito y obtenga otra.

請在選票上打孔

選民須知:

投票時所選擇的任何其他候選人；請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上
候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇你要選舉的候選人打孔，但不
要超過要選舉的候選人數。

投票合格的非候選的候選人，請在非確定候選人選舉信封所提供的預定位上寫下候選人
所預選的職位和候選的姓名。

票選任何提案，請在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有弄溼、污點或損壞，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔誤了，撕破或弄破了，或撕壞了，弄壞了非候選候選人的選舉信封，應
把該選票退還給選舉區的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress—5th District</td>
<td>MIKE GARZA</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly—19th Assembly District</td>
<td>ROBERT R. BACCI</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(There is no contest for State Senator in this District)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.)

本區沒有州參議員選舉。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>INCUMBENT</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terence Faulkner</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Bacci</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas K. Blean</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred &quot;Millie&quot; Danch</td>
<td>Investments - Flight Attendant / Inversiones - Aeromoza</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Vukovich</td>
<td>Presidential Appointee / De Nombramiento Presidencial</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Klobucar</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman / Mujer Miembro del Comité Central Estatal</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita G. Raven</td>
<td>State Committeewoman / Mujer Miembro del Comité Estatal</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Herpe</td>
<td>Industrial Firm President / Presidente, Firma Industrial</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin John Sullivan</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Silvestri</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Election: 5 de Junio de 1984*
NONPARTISAN BALLOT

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT
Office Number One  Vote for One

JUDICIAL

ALBERT C. WOLLENBERG, JR
Judge of Municipal Court

JONATHAN McCURDY
Tenant Attorney

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

16  COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $250,000,000.

YES 163  NO 164

17  NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for the construction, renovation, remodeling, and deferred maintenance of state correctional facilities pursuant to a bond issue of $300,000,000.

YES 167  NO 168

18  CALIFORNIA PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $370,000,000 to be used for specified acquisition, development, rehabilitation, or restoration of real property for park, beach, recreational, or historical preservation purposes.

YES 171  NO 172

19  FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $85,000,000 to be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the State Coastal Conservancy for specified acquisition, enhancement, and development of habitat areas.

YES 175  NO 176

20  ELECTED OFFICIALS. Disqualification where libelous or slanderous campaign statements are made that are major contributing cause to opposition candidate’s defeat. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. If a successful candidate is disqualified, local governments could incur additional election costs if an election is required to fill vacancy.

YES 180  NO 181
### DISPOSICIONES SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Propósito</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Resumen de la Proposición</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para el Desembolso de Capital para Obras de Condominio de 1994</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelado y mantenimiento del condominio para una emisión de bonos por $250,000,000.</td>
<td>一九八四年建築新築之處公施法案。這個法案規定發行公債$250,000,000，用作新築、重建、修繕和更換設備，以及運維維護等費用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para la Construcción de Nuevas Presas de 1994</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone la construcción, renovación, remodelado y mantenimiento de las instalaciones correccionales del estado para una emisión de bonos por $300,000,000.</td>
<td>一九八四年建築新築之處公施法案，這個提案規定發行公債$300,000,000，用作新築、重建、修繕和更換設備，以及運維維護等費用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Acta de Parque e Instalaciones de Recreación de California de 1994</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $370,000,000 para ser usados en la específica adquisición, desarrollo, rehabilitación, o restauración de bienes raíces, para parques, playas, áreas de recreación o para preservación histórica.</td>
<td>一九八四年加州公園及康樂設施法案，這個提案規定發行公債$370,000,000，用作指定的購置、發展、修復及康樂設施，以作公園、海灘、康樂或歷史保存等用途。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Acta de Engranjamiento de los Recursos Pesqueros y del Ámbito Natural de Vida Silvestre de 1994</td>
<td>Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $85,000,000 para que estén disponibles para ser asignados a la Dirección de Conservación de la Vida Silvestre y al Departamento Estatal de Conservación del Litoral para la específica adquisición, engranjamiento y desarrollo de áreas de ámbito natural.</td>
<td>一九八四年海洋與野生動物生態地帶發展法案，這個提案規定發行公債$85,000,000，用作發展野生動物保護區及海洋海岸保護局，作指定的購買、改善及發展生態地帶之用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Funcionarios Elegidos</td>
<td>Desclaron cuando se hayan efectuado declaraciones difamatorias o calumniosas en campañas políticas que contribuyan como una causa mayor a la derrota del candidato oponente. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Si un candidato triunfador es descalificado, los gobiernos locales podrían incurrir en gastos de elección adicionales si se requiere una elección para llenar la vacante.</td>
<td>民選官員，凡發表誹謗性或造謠性競選言論，影響選舉影響公信，對財政影響，無直接財政影響。如一候選人被取消資格，地方政府必須進行一次選舉以補缺，則可能將負額外選舉開支。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENTS. Modifies investment provisions. Declares pension fund assets trust funds. Specifies investment standards for fiduciary. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect would depend on whether public retirement fund investments are at higher or lower rates due to additional flexibility allowed.

YES  185  ➔
NO   186  ➔

EXEMPT STATE CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS. Makes specified manager positions in the PERS and STRS retirement systems exempt from civil service. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. Indirect effect could result if additional flexibility in selection of personnel affects performance of investment programs.

YES  190  ➔
NO   191  ➔

PROPERTY TAXATION. SEISMIC SAFETY CONSTRUCTION EXCLUSION. Excludes from reassessment for property taxation specified reconstructions or improvements for seismic safety purposes. Fiscal impact: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenue and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and possibly other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES  196  ➔
NO   197  ➔

LEGISLATURE: RULES, PROCEDURES, POWERS, FUNDING. Specifies procedures regarding partisan composition of committees, voting requirements, and other matters. Reduces support appropriations. Fiscal impact: Funds for support of Legislature for 1984-85 would be reduced by up to $37 million from the amounts that would otherwise be appropriated. After 1984-85, an upper limit is set on growth in legislative funding.

YES  204  ➔
NO   205  ➔
INVERSIONES DE LOS FONDOS DE JUBILACIÓN PÚBLICOS. Modifica las disposiciones para la inversión. Declara las haberes de la caja de jubilaciones como fondos fiduciarios. Especifica las normas de inversión para el fiduciario. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto dependería de si las inversiones de los fondos de jubilación públicos están a una tasa más alto a más bajo debido a la flexibilidad adicional que se permite.

PUESTOS EXENTOS DEL SERVICIO CIVIL ESTATAL ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Exenta del servicio civil a puestos específicos de directores del Sistema de Jubilación de los Empleados Públicos y del Sistema Estatal de Jubilación de los Maestros. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. Un efecto indirecto podría resultar si la flexibilidad adicional en la selección del personal afecta el rendimiento de los programas de inversiones.

IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE CONSTRUCCIÓN PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL Legislativa. Excluye del reavaluación al impuesto a la propiedad las reconstrucciones o mejoras específicas efectuadas para propósitos de seguridad contra sismos. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida desconocida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad para gobiernos locales y aumento de los costos de avalúo. Aumentos desconocidos de costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos de los distritos escolares y de las universidades binuales de las comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales por pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad. Aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos a la renta debido a menor deducción en los impuestos a la propiedad.

LEGISLATURA: REGLAS, PROCEDIMIENTOS, PODERES, CONSOLIDACIÓN. Especifica los procedimientos respecto a la composición paritaria de los comités, de los requisitos para votar, y de otros asuntos. Reduce las asignaciones para el sostenimiento. Impacto fiscal: Los fondos para el sostenimiento de la Legislatura de 1984-85 serían reducidos hasta por $37 millones de la cantidad que de otra manera hubiera sido asignada. Después de 1984-85, un límite top se fija al crecimiento de la consolidación para la Legislatura.
A Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

B Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o'clock p.m. and 7:00 o'clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

C Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 221
NO 222

E Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226
NO 227

F Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231
NO 232
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a otorgar a empleados de la ciudad condiciones de trabajo o beneficios adicionales comparables a los previstos a empleados en por lo menos 50% de las entidades gubernamentales del Área de la Bahía?

B

¿Deberá pagárselas a las oficiales de policía un 6.25% adicional de su compensación por trabajar noches entre las 5:00 p.m. y las 7:00 a.m., estipulándose que esto no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

C

¿Deberán los bomberos a nivel de entrada que hayan completado diez años de servicio satisfactoriamente recibir compensación del 21/2% adicional, después de quinco años de servicio 5%, y después de veinte años de servicio 7 1/2%, estipulándose que la compensación adicional no aumentará sus beneficios de jubilación?

D

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos de Hetch Hetchy para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?

E

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir bonos de ingresos del Departamento de Aguas para la reconstrucción y reemplazo de instalaciones existentes, mediante el voto de tres cuartas partes de la Junta de Supervisores y deberá necesitar la aprobación de los votantes para la emisión de bonos de ingresos para nuevas instalaciones?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years?</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help Us Help Ronald Reagan!

“Nothing could be more important to the future of our nation than your support for the Republican Party. Our ability to elect more Republicans to office in November depends on your help now.

Elections aren’t won on Election Day—they are won in the months before, when Republicans join together to build a strong organization. Your support for the California Republican Party is critically needed. Please, join us today.”

— Ronald Reagan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I want to help the Republican Party win a major victory this year!

☐ Here's my personal check for the Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund. I'm sending:
  ☐ $15  ☐ $25  ☐ $50  ☐ $100  ☐ Other _______________________________

(Please make check payable to: Republican Party 1984 Victory Fund)

☐ I want to volunteer my time. My telephone # is ( ) ____________________________

**OCCUPATION (REQUIRED BY LAW)**

**OFFICIAL SIGNATURE**

 Please return this form with your contribution. Many thanks. Paid for by the California Republican Party.

Please detach the form above, fill it out, and return it with your donation!
PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION — JUNE 5, 1984

TO FIND THE LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE:
Please refer to the address label on the back cover of this voter pamphlet. For your future reference, please write the address here:

FILL OUT THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS CARD WITH YOUR CHOICES: IT WILL AID YOU IN VOTING. Write the names and numbers of your choices on this card and bring it with you into the voting booth. It will make voting easier for you and will reduce the time others have to wait.

In the case of propositions, circle the number corresponding to “yes” or “no.” This number will appear on your ballot.

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
Vote in the middle of the day, if possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 8.**</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Democrats vote for 8 individual delegates; other parties vote for 1 presidential candidate)</td>
<td>16  163  164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Committee*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*Refer to your sample ballot to determine the number of County Committee candidates to vote for.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRITE YOUR CHOICES ON THIS CARD AND TAKE IT INTO THE VOTING BOOTH WITH YOU.
PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD & CONDADO

G. ¿Deberá el Secretario Gerente General y el Funcionario Inversionista Principal del Sistema de Jubilaciones ser nombrado por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil?

H. ¿Deberá ser eliminada la autoridad para combinar la Oficina del Registro con la Oficina del Registrador de Votantes, y deberá hacerse al funcionario del Registro un funcionario de la Ciudad en forma separada, bajo las órdenes del Funcionario Administrativo Principal?

I. ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores ser reducida de once miembros a nueve miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1984 y deberá posteriormente ser reducida a siete miembros después de la elección de noviembre de 1986, y deberán cambiarse de años pares a años impares las elecciones para Supervisores?

J. ¿Deberá San Francisco adoptar una ordenanza que establece el cobrar los costos de encarcelamiento en una cárcel del condado u otra instalación local de detención a un acusado que la Corte lo considere financieramente capaz de pagar?

K. ¿Deberá adoptarse una ordenanza que prohíbe los permisos de construcción para ciertas estructuras que produzcan considerable sombra sobre propiedades del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, a excepción de aquellos previamente autorizados por la Comisión de Planeamiento Municipal de conformidad con la ordenanza, con ciertas excepciones?
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in this pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLLS—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 16 through 24 because last time the numbers were 1 through 15. In November the State propositions will begin with Proposition 25.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. Under a new law, the handicapped may apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
Candidates for Judge

JONATHAN McCURDY

My address is 80 Alvarado Street, San Francisco
My occupation is Tenant Attorney
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I will bring a needed and revitalizing perspective to the Court. My career has been dedicated and guided by the belief that good government requires that everyone have equal access to justice. I have represented hundreds of tenants in our Municipal Court, argued precedent-setting cases and successfully fought City Hall. This experience has shown me that there is a desperate need for a judge with my background and perspective.

I have not sought or received the support of any of the powerful, special interest groups which dominate the politics of our city. As a result, I won’t be afraid to make the right decision, even if it upsets the power brokers, bankers, and downtown developers. My only allegiance will be to the equal and fair enforcement of the law. If you are satisfied with our court system and want business as usual, don’t vote for me. If you want a judge who has a new perspective and is free of special interests, vote for Jonathan McCurdy.

Jonathan McCurdy

ALBERT E. WOLLENBERG, JR.

My address is 27 Commonwealth Avenue, San Francisco
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of U.C. Boalt Law School and practiced law for 15 years before my appointment to the Municipal Court in 1970. I also served as Presiding Judge for nearly a year and a half.

As Judge of the Municipal Court, I continue to combine sensitivity and understanding with respect for the law, and a commitment to the orderly administration of justice in San Francisco. As Judge, I have helped start a number of constructive changes in our local judicial system.

Many San Francisco attorneys, as well as people in the community support my candidacy.


Albert Wollenberg, Jr.

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
Employee Benefit Formula

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to grant city employees fringe benefits or working conditions comparable to those provided employees in at least 50% of Bay Area government agencies?

YES 212
NO 213

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City surveys wages and benefits in similar government agencies in the Bay Area. Without voter approval, the Board of Supervisors may not provide certain employee benefits similar to those provided in the agencies surveyed.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Board of Supervisors, by ordinance, to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees in the survey.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to be able to provide certain employee benefits that are allowed to at least 50% of the employees surveyed.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to require voter approval for these comparable employee benefits.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, the City could negotiate collective bargaining agreements changing certain employee fringe benefits and working conditions which are now set by Charter formulae. These negotiated benefits could significantly affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 59

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges a Yes vote on Proposition A because Proposition A will promote efficient, effective City government.

Today a rigid, obsolete system regulates employee benefits for the City.

Our present system bears no relationship to the marketplace, or to recognized, sound business practices. In fact, no modern business is run this way.

What are the consequences of this outmoded system?
1. Quality. We are unable to attract the top employees in many fields, and we train workers who move on as soon as they are fully qualified.
2. Cost. Locked into a rigid system, the City is barred from introducing cost-effective new practices.
3. Service. The services provided to taxpayers are essential — fire, police, health, Muni; and also, our libraries, parks, and courts. We need to modernize in order to maintain and improve the quality of City service.

Proposition A is an important step toward modernizing San Francisco city government.

We support Proposition A because we believe it will improve the efficient delivery of services, and enable San Francisco to attract and retain well qualified employees.

We strongly recommend a Yes vote on Proposition A.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In its treatment of public employees, San Francisco is an outcast among urban centers.

In every large county in California, in big cities across the country, public employees can bargain with local governments for basic job benefits. These benefits include life insurance, dental plans, family health coverage, and disability insurance. San Francisco, the fairest and most forward-looking city in the United States, does not afford its own workers this basic right. In this respect, San Francisco shows a lack of foresight. Public employees are the very backbone of city government, and hence, of a well-run city. San Francisco needs the best workers it can get. In return, San Francisco must be fair to its workers, and give them the same rights as employees in other cities and counties.

Let’s make our fair city truly fair. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!
Honorable Willie L. Brown
Speaker of the Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

In the next 20 years, San Francisco’s growth rate will be phenomenal.

This growth will place even more pressure on essential city services — services such as police and fire protection and transportation. To handle that pressure, and to make our growth as smooth as possible, San Francisco needs talented, productive and dedicated workers in all areas of government.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco attract those workers. Without PROPOSITION “A”, we face an uncertain future. Because city government is only as effective as the people who work for it.

PROPOSITION A does not force the City to spend any additional money on public employees.

PROPOSITION A simply asks that the City engage in a fair, responsible, and widely accepted business practice: negotiating benefit plans for City and County employees. It lets the City take a more flexible stance in negotiations with groups of public workers. It lets the City explore creative proposals for saving taxpayers’ money.

Public employees can bargain for family health plans, dental coverage, life insurance and disability insurance in every major county in California and most major cities in the United States. But not in San Francisco! Without PROPOSITION “A”, our loss will be these cities’ and counties’ gain.

Take stock in San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Honorable Sala Burton
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

If San Francisco and its employees are unable to reach an agreement in these negotiations, the final say on benefits for employees would still be up to the voters. PROPOSITION A does not lock the City into any agreement.

Vote for a fair, responsible, and efficient San Francisco.
Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Honorable Milton Marks
State Senator

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

Proposition A will give city and county workers a basic right. It will give them the same right that workers in other large counties and cities have had for years: the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance, and disability insurance.

This basic right will give workers and their families a measure of security. It will bring labor relations in San Francisco up to date. And because a secure worker is likely to be more satisfied with the job, it will slow turnover among public workers. And that means a better-run city.

Give city workers a fair deal. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Art Agnos
Member, California State Assembly

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” is a vote to keep San Francisco great!

It is a vote to keep public employees from leaving San Francisco for cities where they can bargain for such basic benefits as dental coverage, family health plans, life insurance and disability insurance.

A vote for PROPOSITION “A” will keep San Francisco’s best, most productive, and hardest-working public employees in San Francisco. It will help our city run more efficiently, and it will help our city get, and keep, the best workers available.

Vote for a hard-working government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is falling behind the times in its treatment of public employees.

Every major county in California, except San Francisco, bargains with its public employees for basic benefits. As a result, some of our best public employees have begun looking elsewhere. And it’s harder to attract bright, talented workers when other cities and counties appear to offer better conditions.

Better public employees make a better city government, and that makes for a more pleasant city for everyone.

Vote to keep San Francisco one of America’s best-run cities. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a better-run City.

Proposition A will attract the hardest-working, most dedicated and talented workers to San Francisco. And it will keep them here.

Proposition A locks the City into nothing. If negotiations are unsuccessful, then any benefits for public employees would still go before the voters.

Proposition A will benefit everyone — especially the taxpayers of San Francisco.

Vote for good city government and help keep San Francisco great. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

During my years as Chief of Police and as a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, I learned the great responsibility city managers have to attract and retain skilled, dedicated workers.

PROPOSITION A will provide city managers with more flexibility to do just that. We will all profit by more effective delivery of services and more efficient city government.

We cannot afford to lose the best police officers and fire fighters. Let’s hold our city managers accountable for the quality of service to taxpayers.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

Al Nelder
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

To keep local government running smoothly, San Francisco needs good people working for it.

It needs people who are talented, well-trained and well-versed in their duties. Satisfied workers stay in their jobs. And an experienced workforce knows how to get things done, and get them done efficiently.

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco maintain such a workforce by giving employees what almost all public employees have: the right to bargain for job benefits. Basic benefits such as dental plans and family health coverage. PROPOSITION “A” will attract the brightest, hardest-working public employees to the greatest city in the world, San Francisco. And it will keep them here!

Vote for good local government. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”.

Wendy Nelder
President, SF Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco lacks what businesses everywhere regard as a responsible, worthwhile practice: bargaining for job benefits with its employees for basic benefits, such as a family health plan, dental coverage, and insurance in case of death or disability.

Proposition A doesn’t give public employees these benefits, but it does give them the right to bargain for them. In the event the city and its employees reach no agreement, the final decision would be left up to the voters. Proposition A does not obligate the city to spend any extra on public employees.

Proposition A is a much-needed reform to modernize San Francisco’s labor relations. Now and in the long run, Proposition A is unquestionably in the city’s best interests. Because the best workers go to the best jobs.

Getting and keeping the best public employees helps maintain the quality of San Francisco’s basic services — services such as transportation, police and fire protection, and city planning. A more efficient work force means less waste. And that saves the taxpayers money.

Support a well-run San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Sam Duca
Assessor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Every city needs dedicated, hard-working police officers and fire fighters.

San Francisco is no exception. To attract and retain the finest public servants, San Francisco must not lag behind other cities in providing an attractive job atmosphere.

Police and firemen can bargain for benefits in virtually every major U.S. city. We cannot afford to have our fine police and fire departments gutted by deflections to these cities.

Let’s keep San Francisco a safe and secure place to live.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Keith Calden
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
William Murray
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Fire Dept.
Tom Cahill
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.
Donald Scott
Ret. Chief of the San Francisco Police Dept.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will give San Francisco much needed flexibility in negotiating with public employee unions.

PROPOSITION “A” would not obligate the city to pay public employees any more than they are paid now. It could even save the city money. PROPOSITION “A” would enable local government to explore new proposals.

PROPOSITION “A” would not lead to binding contract negotiations. If the city and employees reach an impasse, the ultimate decision on benefits would still rest with the voters.

PROPOSITION “A” gives away nothing. It could save the city money, and that means it could save taxpayers money, too!

Vote for a flexible and responsible city government.
VOTE FOR PROPOSITION “A”!

Honorable Ben Tom
President, Board of Education
Honorable Sadomi Wilson
Vice President, Board of Education
Honorable Dick Corcoran
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Libby Derebein
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Eugene Hopp
Member, Board of Education
Honorable Myra Kupa
Member, Board of Education

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A could save the city, and taxpayers, money. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits. And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Honorable Gordon Lau
Member, Port Commission

Honorable Sue Bierman
Member, Planning Commission

Honorable Peter Ashe
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Warren De Merritt
Member, Retirement Board

Honorable Jerome H. Klein
Member, Planning Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Public employees in San Francisco are denied a basic right. It’s the right to bargain with their employer for benefits. Public employees lack health coverage for their families, dental plans, and life insurance. And they can’t negotiate with the city to get them.

Proposition A will give public employees that right. And ultimately, Proposition A will save the city, and taxpayers, money. It will let the city explore ways of trading employee salaries for benefits, thereby lifting some of the burden caused by payroll taxes. If the city pays for some preventive health care, we all avoid the far greater cost to society of expensive hospital treatment.

Nothing in Proposition A forces the city to spend more on public employees. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ultimate decision on employee benefits still lies with the voters.

But by giving public employees the right to bargain with the city, Proposition A will keep the best city workers here in San Francisco. Those workers will have no incentive to leave for other cities, cities that already allow bargaining for benefits.

And a more talented and dedicated public sector helps everyone in the long run, because an efficient city runs more cheaply.

Vote for fairness and effectiveness in city government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Michael Bernick
President, San Francisco Democratic Club

George Ando
President, Japanese Democratic Club

David Looman
President, West of Twin Peaks Democratic Club

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committee

JoAnne Miller
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Geary
Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Bob Morales
President, Bay Area Labor Union Party

Jim Wachob
President, District 8 Democratic Club

Carole Migden
President, Harvey Milk Democratic Club

Sal Russelli, President
Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club

Carolyn Reilly
President, Irish American Democratic Club

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will give public employees in San Francisco the right to bargain for basic benefits. Employees have this right in virtually every major U.S. city. Why not San Francisco?

Proposition A is fair to workers, and it’s good government.

Vote yes on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Tim Twomey
President
San Francisco Central Labor Council

Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trades Council

Chuck Mack
Bay Area Teamsters Joint Council

LeRoy King
International Longshoreman’s and Warehouseman’s Union
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A. Right now, the men and women who work for San Francisco City and County are unable to protect their families adequately because they have no family health insurance. Lost time off the job, and loss in service to the taxpayers, is the result.

Proposition A will enable the City to correct this deficiency, but does not require it to do so. In the long run it’s fair, and it will mean a better City for all of us.

Jane McKaske Murphy
Former Supervisor and
Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

PROPOSITION “A” will help San Francisco city services grow as the city does.

San Francisco’s police must be the best available to keep our neighborhoods safe. Its fire fighters must be dedicated and hardworking, and all city and county workers must be satisfied that San Francisco is the best city possible to work in.

San Francisco can’t afford to lose its best police, its most skilled fire fighters, its most talented staff to cities that offer better working conditions. That is why San Francisco needs PROPOSITION “A”. A YES vote on PROPOSITION “A” will keep our best public servants right here at home. It will keep our city competitive.

Don’t skimp on San Francisco’s future. Vote YES on PROPOSITION “A”!

Dr. Tim Wolfred
President
San Francisco Community College Board
Chuck Ayala
Member
San Francisco Community College Board
Alan Wong
Member
San Francisco Community College Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

As independent businessmen, we know how important it is to take responsibility for making critical decisions about our businesses. We expect elected officials and city managers to take the same responsibility for the City’s business.

We support Proposition A because it makes good business sense. We want our City to be run as efficiently as we run our businesses.

Jack Creighton
Visitacion Valley Merchants Association
Jay Johnson
President, Eureka Valley Merchants Association
Robert Pachew
Past President, Geneva-Mission Business Association
Harry Phitoban
Century 21 Gibraltar Realty
Pat Short
Past President, Polk Street Merchants Association
Joe Udoch
Proprietor, Oceanside Sheet Metal

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Imagine if your boss told you that bargaining for basic job benefits was out of the question because the law wouldn’t allow it.

Imagine if you had to pay for your family’s health care and your dental treatment out of your own pocket. Public employees in San Francisco know what it’s like to have a job that doesn’t cover these costly services.

Proposition A would give public employees the right to bargain with the city for these benefits. It would let them bargain for their security, and for the security of their families.

Every major county in California gives public employees this right. So do most major U.S. cities. It’s time San Francisco did, too. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Joseph P. Lacey
Chair, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on A for more effective delivery of services to San Francisco neighborhoods.

Improved City service for our neighborhoods is our top priority. To get good service, you have to provide standard benefits.

We urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because the time has come to upgrade service to our neighborhoods.

Reverend Cecil Williams
Glide Memorial Church
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

How would you feel if you and your family were not covered by health insurance?
Basic benefits such as a family health plan, dental coverage, life insurance and disability. You might worry about your future.

All San Franciscans should be worried about their future — the future of their city government. For San Francisco does not even give its public employees the right to bargain for these basic benefits. And the best public employees, the most talented, will be considering cities and counties where the jobs are more attractive, where they have the right to bargain for benefits.

Proposition A can keep San Francisco from falling behind other cities. Proposition A would not force the city to pay any money. But it would give it flexibility in negotiating with city workers. And those workers would be able to bargain for benefits. If an impasse occurred, the last word would still belong with the voters.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for a fair City and a brighter future. Vote yes on A.

Louise Ogden
President
San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We, the undersigned San Franciscans, urge a Yes vote on Proposition A because it is in the tradition of fairness and pride in our City.

San Franciscans know that we have to work constantly to maintain and improve our City. Proposition A takes a necessary step toward improving our City government by modernizing the method of setting employee benefits.
Proposition A will mean better City service, and a better City, for all of us.

Vote Yes on A.

Dorothy L. Jaymes
Grandval A. Jackson

Mabel E. Bailey
Douglas Haynes

Mattie Scott
Martha Simmons
Forrest Pritchett
Gloria Johnson
Matilda Whetstone
Mildred Sorrells
Ben Johnson
Bessie Stoneham
Jane Reynolds
Constance Rodgers
Tommie Steele Jr.
Rita Darree
Robert B. Johnson Jr.
Gregory E. Fields
Gwendolyn Thibodeaux
Juanita Francis
Albert R. Carter
Annie Y. Bruford

Anthony Wagner
Beatrice Brown
Elissa Mobley
Garrett Smith
Lenora Meacham
Madison J. Bland
Reverend Johnnie Robinson
Arthur Kelling
Mary-Ellen W. Garr
Audrey V. Jackquez
Rufus Cunn
Dorothy V. Kelsey
Anna Doll Taylor
William Bailey
Gloria Duke
Lynette Hoymes
Arthur W. Rose
Dorothy Elliott

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will keep San Francisco great.
It will give the best public employees incentive to stay here. It will give the city flexibility in labor negotiations. It will make our future a little more secure.

Vote for a better San Francisco. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Luis P. Blue
Martha Ryan
Marla O'Brien

Virginia Lozada
Cornelius Gallagher
Jane Seidenberg

Sally Buf
Anamar Cruz
John Garb
Bryna Balm
Lily Tseu
Eva Tan
Germaine Uribe
Pat Hoover
Lloyd C. Jackson
Nova Bevel
Brenda Barros

Jean Perchino
Carolyn Davis
Laurie Smith
Mike Rifkin
Margaret Kahn
Janet L. Kallet, R.N.
Shoshana Silberman
Lorraine Anne Thiebaud
Evelyn Hannah
Bobbie Vance

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A will introduce much needed Civil Service reform into San Francisco.
Proposition A is a message to our supervisors that we want flexibility in dealing with public employees. Proposition A would give our City to exchange outdated, expensive practices for current benefits. The result could be savings to the taxpayers and to the employees.

Proposition A is a message that San Franciscans would rather support preventive health care than subsidize expensive hospital treatment of others through their own health insurance.

A vote for Proposition A is a vote for more efficient, less wasteful local government. Vote yes on Proposition A.

Agnes Jakes
Pat Jackson
Bill Kraus

Marie Jobling
Teza Roofe adherence
Ron Haberman
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco is in danger of allowing its public sector workforce to deteriorate.

San Francisco is one of the few great cities of the United States in denying its public employees the privilege of bargaining for job benefits. San Francisco is falling behind the cities that give workers this privilege, because these cities can offer public employees more attractive working conditions. Our best public servants are beginning to look elsewhere.

Proposition A does not obligate the city to pay any sum of money. But it would elevate San Francisco back among the leaders in its relations with public employees.

Proposition A is a bargain. Vote yes on A.

Shirley Black
Member, Planning Association of the Richmond
Charles Breyer, Attorney
Regina Sweed
Lydia San Felippo
John J. Simpson, Retired
Susan Kelly Kennedy

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “A”.

This Charter Amendment circumvents all existing Charter sections that would permit you, the voter, to approve all new costly employee fringe benefits. Instead, the Board of Supervisors would be permitted to “collectively bargain” for any and all benefits and working conditions, including life insurance, disability insurance, and a dental plan for more than 24,000 employees.

This Charter Amendment can and will cost you, the voters, literally, tens of millions of dollars — and very fast.

You will lose your present right to vote on each benefit.

Proposals for fringe benefits should be submitted to the voters one at a time, and I am prepared to do just that. Pay and benefits for our employees should be comparable with surrounding counties, many of which already provide dental coverage and life and disability insurance. Proposition “A” would open wholesale the floodgates to increased costs while removing your

and my basic right to know and control these costs. This Amendment not only would open up all fringe benefits for miscellaneous workers, but also for Police, Fire and Municipal Railway employees. Its costs could exceed $25 million in just a year or two.

Frankly, as Mayor, I cannot continue to recommend budgets to expand your library, police, park, health and social services unless I have some say in controlling the size and timing of large pay and fringe benefit packages.

This Amendment makes prudent budgeting much more difficult, and will increase your costs dramatically in unprecedented ways.

So, keep your basic right to vote on employee fringe benefits and to know their costs before you are saddled with the bills.

Vote NO on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

In 1975 and 1976, San Francisco voters finally achieved some control over runaway salaries and compensation benefits for city employees and give-away supervisors. A number of Charter reforms were adopted. Now, there is a threat one such reform will be repealed unless you vote “NO” on Proposition A.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Non-salary benefits for city employees are now set by Charter. Voter approval is required for any increased or new benefits. Proposition A would deprive voters of their right to say “yes” or “no” to higher or new benefits for city employees.

The Civil Service Commission does not recommend Proposition A. The head of civil service also recommended no endorsement. The Controller said to the Board of Supervisors on March 5, 1984 that this could substantially affect the cost of govern-

ment, meaning in his own words, at least $500,000 per year in higher costs to taxpayers. The manager of civil service also said on March 5th that Proposition A will “open up the world” on non-salary benefits. In fact, it will eliminate voter review power over 22 different charter compensation benefit provisions. The Employee Relations Division of the Board of Supervisors states its operating costs would in effect be increased 75% if Proposition A passes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

Don’t let the Board of Supervisors eliminate your power over people who work for you. Don’t let the Board add to taxpayer burdens. Vote “NO” on Proposition A and maintain stable and equitable salary and non-salary benefits for our employees.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Employee Benefit Formula

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote No on Proposition A. Presently only the voters of San Francisco determine the fringe benefit package for City Civil Service employees. Proposition A will allow City Civil Service employees to negotiate their own benefit package.

In the mid 1970's, after experiencing a series of major City employee strikes resulting from unresolved labor negotiations, the voters approved a formula system for setting employee salaries.

By opening fringe benefits to negotiations, the City treasury will be vulnerable to unspecific and unidentified costs which cannot be predetermined. This is financially unsound.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Whose economic judgement do you trust the most? The City’s voters and taxpayers who currently must APPROVE and PAY for new fringes, or the historically SPAGHETTI-SPINED Board of Supervisors?

Giving this power to pusillanimous past Boards proved to be a municipal DISASTER! How do you think we got HIDDEN fringe costs HIGHER for some City employees than their base pay check?

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION A

I authored or co-authored all of the city employee benefit reforms of 1975-76. Now, Supervisor Molinari, in an election year give-away, has introduced Proposition A which will undo the Charter reforms you approved overwhelmingly. Reforms which kept our city from insolvency and even higher taxes.

This measure would allow the Board of Supervisors to repeat the fiscal blunders of the 1960’s by providing additional compensation benefits over and above salary increases, even if voters have rejected such compensation benefits.

Dental benefits are but one of many examples. Voters have disapproved them twice since 1977; under Proposition A, voters won’t have power anymore to approve or disapprove such benefits in the future. The Board of Supervisors ballot argument is intellectually dishonest. It never once tells you that your power over city employee non-salary compensation will be lost if Proposition A passes.

Despite the significant additional costs referred to in the contractor’s statement, Supervisor Molinari with union prodding, got the Board of Supervisors to put this on the ballot. Why? Because self-serving Supervisors like Molinari can’t stand up to special interest pressure, especially in an election year.

John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A!

Let’s not put the Board of Supervisors back into the business of negotiating fringe benefits.

Republican County Central Committee

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Police Night Pay

PROPOSITION B

Shall police officers be paid an additional 6.25% of their compensation for working nights between 5:00 o’clock p.m. and 7:00 o’clock a.m., provided it will not increase their retirement benefits?

YES 216
NO 217

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers are paid for a 40-hour week. The pay is the same whether these hours are worked during the daytime or at night.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B says that police officers who work between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. will get an extra 6.25% of their base pay. This additional night pay will not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get an additional 6.25% of their base pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS that you want police officers who work at night to get no additional pay for night work.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Richard Hongisto.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on current staffing patterns and salary levels, increase the cost of government by approximately $1,275,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 59

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early
Application must reach the Registrar at least 1 week before election
Police Night Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition "B" will bring fairness and equity to the City’s work force. Most City employees are now entitled to a 6.25% night differential pay if they work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Our police officers are presently not eligible for this differential. Proposition "B" would extend this benefit to police officers.

There are 799 civilian employees working in the police department. If their work assignment falls between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., they receive a 6.25% night differential. But our sworn police officers, many of whom work between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., are denied this benefit. This disparity creates a major inequity.

Proposition "B" grants to police officers, who work during the night time providing public safety and security, the same night differential benefit for which over 20,000 other City employees are eligible if assigned to night work.

Vote YES on Proposition "B". It is fair to provide equal benefits to our police officers. It is fair to compensate police officers for the extra danger they encounter during night work.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Your "YES" vote on Proposition B will ensure our city more effective police protection because police officers will be able to receive the same kind of extra pay that other City employees do for night work.

The City's Charter presently prohibits policemen from negotiating for pay or benefits increases. As a result, they do not yet enjoy the extra compensation for night duty that is standard for other City law officers — such as employees of the Sheriff's Department or Airport Police — and for most civilian employees as well.

Proposition B would eradicate this inequity by allowing

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Police Department officers to be compensated at a standard 6.25% above base pay, during the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No additional expenses to the City, such as increased retirement benefits, would accrue.

Currently, most night patrol officers have less experience than those working the day shift, because there is no inducement for officers with seniority to work night hours. Pay differential would provide that inducement, and assure that better prepared policemen are patrolling our streets at all hours.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION B.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Please vote yes on Proposition B.

Sala Burton
Member of Congress

Barbara Boxer
Member of Congress

Art Agnos
Assemblyman 16th Assembly District

Wendy Nelder
President of San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

City employees in the criminal justice system, such as deputy sheriffs, park patrol officers, museum guards, airport police and building and grounds officers, now receive a 6¼% premium for night work, but our own San Francisco Police Department police officers do not.

This is a matter of equality of treatment for regular police officers who enforce both state and local laws. That's why I intend to vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Night differential in one form or another is a standard for police officers throughout the state of California. In San Francisco, night differential is standard for all employees including those that are sworn peace officers (i.e. airport, sheriffs, etc.) The only police officers not receiving night differential are the San Francisco Police Officers. Your vote will correct this inequity.

Vote “YES” on Proposition B.

Milton Marks
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

YES ON B

As members of the Police Commission, it is our responsibility to organize and administer the police department in order to make it the most efficient law enforcement agency it can be.

One of the major concerns facing the department at this time is that the element of experience amongst the rank and file officers is unequally distributed, leaving the evening and night time shifts to be covered by relatively less experienced officers. Though qualified to do the job, these younger officers are in need of the guidance and direction that only seasoned officers can provide.

Proposition B is a fair charter amendment which would help to capitalize on the vital element of experience by attracting senior officers to work when they are needed most; the “high crime” evening and night time hours.

Al Nelder
David Sanchez
Jo Daly
Burl Toler
Members San Francisco Police Commission

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B presents the voters of San Francisco with an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this city’s Police Department. This measure will provide an extra 6.25% in pay for officers who must work between the hours of 5:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. — those hours when the level of experience an officer brings to the job is critical. This incentive will help bring more experienced officers to the night shifts at a time when the officers now serving on those shifts have been employed about 3 years or less. Improve our Police Department while using experience.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Jane McKaskle Murphy
Former Police Commissioner
Arlo Smith
District Attorney

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Most other city employees, including sheriffs and airport police officers, receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe that our police officers should definitely receive it as well.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Lee Dolson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“Night Differential’ is as basic as “apple pie.’” Most other city employees; including sheriffs and airport police officers receive this form of compensation in lieu of working the late evening and midnight hours. I firmly believe

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

that our police officers should **definitely** receive it as well.

I urge you to vote **YES** on Proposition B.

Ernest “Chuck” Ayala

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!**

San Francisco’s Police Department provides round-the-clock protection and service, with officers assigned to one of three shifts based upon seniority; length of service in the Department. While employees of other city departments who work night shifts have long enjoyed an incentive for having to work these odd hours, police officers have been shortchanged in this benefit area. This Proposition will directly address that inequity by providing an added 6.25% in pay for the officers who must work those shifts.

**John F. Foran**
State Senator — 8th District

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**YES ON PROPOSITION B**

Amending the charter to provide night time differential will increase the quality of police service in San Francisco.

Prop B is cost efficient and **good government**.

Vote Yes on Prop B.

**Al Casiato**, President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.

**Don Scott**
Former Chief of Police

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:**

- Fight crime. Give policemen hazard compensation for dangerous nighttime duty.

Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Max Woods
Republican State Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate

Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman
Former City Commissioner

John May
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Tom Spinosa
Republican Central Committeeman
Congressional Candidate

Leslie Payne
Republican Central Committeeman

Stanley Bronwell
Republican Central Committeeman

Dennis Mark
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Shirley Spinosa
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Al Harry Herpe
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Kevin Sullivan
Republican Central Committee Candidate

Lisa Klobuchar
Republican Central Committee Candidate

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B**

**DEMOCRATS FOR NIGHT PAY:**

San Francisco police deserve reasonable pay for dangerous night work.

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Central Committeeman

Alexa Smith
Democratic Central Committee Candidate

Bob Geary
Democratic Central Committeeman

Patrick Fitzgerald
Democratic Central Committeeman

JoAnne Miller
Democratic Central Committeewoman

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B**

The concept of "**NIGHT PREMIUM PAY**" for police work is preposterous!

Every job applicant knows in advance that working at night to catch felons and protect the citizenry "goes with the territory"! It is one of the reasons why a regular "entry rank" Q2 Patrolman’s annual "pay package" is $60,101.81 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 96% of base pay! In addition, ALL Police Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay raises again in July.

**William F. O’Keefe, Sr.**
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEEMAN.
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PROPOSITION C

Shall entry level firefighters who have completed ten years of satisfactory service receive 2 1/2% additional compensation, after fifteen years service 5% and after twenty years service 7 1/2%, providing that the additional compensation shall not increase their retirement benefits?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco firefighters join the Fire Department at the entry-rank (H2). After entry-rank firefighters reach the top step of their pay scale, they do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would provide additional pay for entry-rank firefighters after they have performed their duties satisfactorily for a number of years. These increases would be:
- 2 1/2% over base pay after 10 years of service,
- 5% over base pay after 15 years of service,
- 7 1/2% over base pay after 20 years of service.

The additional pay would not increase their retirement benefits.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay after they have worked satisfactorily for the department for at least 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want entry-rank firefighters to get additional pay based on length of satisfactory service.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher and Louise Renne.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would, based on the present length of service and salaries of current members of the Fire Department, increase the cost of government by approximately $550,000 per year.”

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING
(SEE INSERT)

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C BEGINS ON PAGE 35
Firefighter Longevity Pay

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is a simple matter of fairness.

Presently, Fire Fighters do not receive additional pay based on the number of years they have been with the department. While common sense dictates that this most hazardous of jobs increases exposure to accident over time, there is no merit pay increase for years spent “on-the-front line” fighting fires here in San Francisco.

This is neither fair nor equitable. Teachers, military personnel, private industry... and even other fire departments — grant merit pay increases for satisfactory job performance over the years.

A cross-section of California cities with some sort of time-on-the-job merit pay increases include: Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, Burlingame, Daly City, Healdsburg, La Habre, National City, Oxnard, Redondo Beach, Sacramento, San Joaquin County, Santa Clara, South San Francisco, Stockton, and Torrance.

This merit pay formula does not count toward retirement benefits and excludes officers, who receive time and merit pay increases through promotion. Further, any Fire Fighter suspended or otherwise disciplined by the Fire Chief or Fire Commission does not qualify for merit pay for a set period of time.

This fairness issue rewards rank-and-file Fire Fighters for years of faithful service, creates incentive for experienced fire fighters to stay “on-the-front line”, and puts us in line with other fire fighters state-wide.

We urge a Yes Vote on Proposition C.

James T. Ferguson
President
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The Members of the Fire Commission listed below, and the Fire Chief, are opposed to Proposition “C”, a plan to establish longevity pay for certain uniformed members of the Fire Department.

The proposed Charter amendment is unfair and exclusionary as it would apply only to firefighters, excluding all other uniformed members of the Department. Thus, creating a potential morale problem. Also, longevity is usually enacted to assure the retention of trained and experienced firefighters, a problem which does not exist in the San Francisco Fire Department, as witnessed by the fact that during the last seven years only thirty-two firefighters have resigned.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition “C”.

Fire Chief Emmet Condon
Fire Commission President Henry Berman
Fire Commissioner Juanita Del Carlo
Fire Commissioner Anne Howden
Fire Commissioner Robert Nicco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This bizarre “TIME SERVED” proposal would raise each fireman’s pay an additional $756.68, $1,513.36, or $2,270.05 respectively. Their current annual “pay package” for a regular “entry rank” H2 Hoseman is already $62,825.86 including a medical plan and retirement costs at 105% of base pay! In addition, ALL Fire Department personnel will receive substantial AUTOMATIC pay increases again in July!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
PRESIDENT.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This Charter Amendment would cost taxpayers $561,200 the FIRST YEAR to solve a fictional, non-existent “RAPID TURNOVER” problem perceived solely by the Fire Fighter’s Union! The cost in future years will obviously be higher!

In the Fire Department, there is virtually NO TURNOVER! In the last FIVE YEARS there have been only twenty-nine resignations from a budgeted force of 1569 firemen!

The Fire Chief, the Fire Commission, and the Civil Service Commission ALL oppose proposition “C”.

If passed, this “longevity of service” premium pay concept will immediately be demanded by ALL other City workers at an annual cost of millions!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “C”.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., PRESIDENT.
Robert Guichard, VICE PRESIDENT.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "C".

The City has been generous to our firefighters, both in the department's annual budget requests and in wage and benefit increases. However, I oppose this special salary increase for firefighters.

Our City Charter provides a formula to guarantee that firefighters receive an annual salary increase. This keeps them paid at the average rate of the largest cities of California and I think this is fair and proper. It has served us well and it has been good to our firefighters. During the last five years that I have been Mayor, the Charter formula has increased firefighter salaries by almost $9,000. The current salary is over $30,000 a year, which is sufficiently high to attract thousands of job applicants.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C. The stated intent of this Charter amendment is to prevent early retirement and retain senior firemen. Yet both the Fire Chief and the Fire Commission say there is no retention problem and are opposed to this measure. And if passed, Proposition C will cost the City an estimated $484,000 annually though it will not accomplish its stated goal.

The City Charter has established a fair and equitable method of setting wage scales comparable to the major city fire departments in California. Our Charter provides a proven method that is both fair to the firemen and fair to the public, those who pay the bills.

San Francisco's firemen have one of the most generous wage and benefits packages in California. Yet year after year the voters are presented with measures designed to increase their already superior renumeration. If the "problem" alleged in Proposition C does not exist, then this is just another raid on the City treasury.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance:

1. for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in said city;

2. for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

3. for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

4. shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(Continued on page 59)
Hetch Hetchy Financing

PROPOSITION E

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 226

NO 227

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Hetch Hetchy project is the City’s water transport and power generating facility. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water and electric power facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Hetch Hetchy income. A majority of the voters must approve the sale of the bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition E would also set up a Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Hetch Hetchy Project.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other Hetch Hetchy bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Hetch Hetchy Projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E BEGINS ON PAGE 37
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy Hydroelectric Power System to issue revenue bonds, thus providing an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “E” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “E” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since Hetch Hetchy is fully self-supporting. In fact, the project makes a significant contribution to the City’s General Fund each year, funds which are used to support police and fire services, recreation, library and the other services supported by the General Fund. Thus, the necessary investments made to secure Hetch Hetchy’s facilities, and thus its earning power, are a benefit to the general tax base.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes Hetch Hetchy from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “E” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Proposition “E” would allow our Hetch Hetchy system to issue revenue bonds to pay for the replacement of machinery and structures or the building of new facilities.

This amendment would modernize Charter language to allow Hetch Hetchy the ability to issue revenue bonds in a manner similar to other City revenue-making departments.

Bonds issued to pay for replacement of worn or damaged equipment or structures would require the approval of both 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor and no bonds for new facilities could be sold without a vote of the citizens of San Francisco.

Any bonds issued would be repaid by Hetch Hetchy revenues from its sale of electricity. The citizens of San Francisco would not pay for the bonds, no new taxes would result and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

Without this amendment, our hydro-electric power system would be unable to quickly replace facilities that might be damaged or need replacement. Protect our historic investment in the Hetch Hetchy system.

Vote YES on Proposition “E”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Voter approval of revenue bond issues provides necessary checks and balances.

Republican County Central Committee

TEXTE OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-2 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.313 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the Hetch Hetchy project shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Hetch Hetchy Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Hetch Hetchy revenue fund, including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the Hetch Hetchy project and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of principal, interest, reserve, sinking funds, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of Hetch Hetchy or related facilities.
PROPOSITION F

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue Water Department revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Supervisors and need voter approval for issuing revenue bonds for new facilities?

YES 231

NO 232

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Water Department revenue bonds now may not be issued without approval of a majority of voters. If the Public Utilities Commission wants to sell revenue bonds to acquire, build, improve or develop water facilities it must submit the bond issue to the voters. These bonds are repaid from Water Department income.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F says that with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, the Public Utilities Commission could issue revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities. All other Water Department bond issues would require voter approval. Proposition F would also set up a Water Revenue Fund to pay off the revenue bonds and to operate the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission, with the approval of 3/4 of the Board of Supervisors, to be able to sell revenue bonds for reconstruction and replacement. All other water department bond issues would require voter approval.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want all Water Department revenue bonds to be submitted to the voters for approval.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application, revenue bonds could be issued in specified circumstances to finance certain Water Department projects. The effect, if any, of these possible future actions on the cost of government can not be estimated at this time.”

POLLs ARE OPEN FROM 7AM TO 8PM
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would allow our Water Department to issue revenue bonds to pay for replacement and improvement of its facilities.

Like Proposition “E”, this Charter amendment is necessary so that our Water Department can issue revenue bonds. These bonds would be paid out of the revenues of the Water Department and not from your tax dollars.

Your YES vote for Proposition “E” only allows the Water Department to issue bonds to replace worn, damaged or outdated equipment and facilities if 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors (9 members) and the Mayor agree. Any bonds for new facilities would require a vote of the people.

Proposition “F” will result in no new taxes and the City would not be obligated to use existing tax dollars.

It will insure the continued trouble-free operation of our water system.

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote Yes on Proposition “F”.

Proposition “F” would provide a method for the Board of Supervisors or the people to approve the issuance of revenue bonds by our San Francisco Water Department. Proposition “F” would provide an efficient, economical method of financing the repair or replacement of worn-out facilities whenever funds for such replacements would be needed.

Proposition “F” would amend the Charter to allow the sale of bonds to finance the replacement of existing facilities without a vote of the people, but only with approval of three-fourths of the members of the Board of Supervisors. It prohibits the sale of bonds for any new facilities without a specific further vote of approval by the people.

Proposition “F” would cost NOTHING to the taxpayers generally since the Water Department is fully self-supporting. We already have an enormous investment in the pipelines, dams, filtration plants and other facilities of our water distribution network. A prudent repair/replacement policy for the major assets of the Water Department is a sure way to protect against unjustifyable rate increases to finance unanticipated facility replacement costs.

Currently, a technicality in the law precludes the Water Department from selling revenue bonds. Proposition “F” would remedy this without removing the people’s power to approve at the polls any new proposed facilities.

We urge you to Vote YES on Proposition “F”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Vote NO on Proposition F!

San Francisco voters should continue to have the right to approve or reject Water Department revenue bond issues.

Republican County Central Committee

NOTE: These sections are entirely new.

6.407-1 Water Department Revenue Fund

(a) Subject to the budget and fiscal provisions of this charter whenever revenue bonds issued by the public utilities commission pursuant to section 7.312 are outstanding, the entire gross revenue of the water department shall be set aside and deposited into a fund in the city and county treasury to be known as the “Water Department Revenue Fund.” All amounts paid into said fund shall be maintained by the treasurer separate and apart from all other city and county funds and shall be secured by the treasurer’s official bond or bonds. Separate accounts shall be kept of said fund with respect to receipts and disbursements. Said fund shall be exempt from section 6.407(a).

(b) Monies in the Water Department Revenue Fund including earnings thereon, shall be appropriated, transferred, expended or used for the following purposes pertaining to the financing, maintenance and operation of the water department and related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission and only in accordance with the following priority: (1) the payment of operation and maintenance expenses for such utility and related facilities; (2) the payment of pension charges and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurances or outside reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require with respect to employees of the commission; (3) the payment of

(Continued on page 62)
Retirement Managers Exemption

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Secretary-General Manager and the Chief Investment Officer of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from Civil Service?

YES 236

NO 237

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System is governed by the Retirement Board and has a secretary-general manager and a chief investment officer who are hired under the civil service provisions of the Charter.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Retirement Board to appoint its own secretary-general manager and chief investment officer. These two positions would be exempt from civil service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its secretary-general manager and its chief investment officer. You want both of these positions to be exempt from civil service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the secretary-general manager and the chief investment officer to remain under civil service.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On March 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 62

Your Absentee Ballot Application
is now a card insert located on or about page 48 of this pamphlet.

Please print your name clearly.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G is designed to provide the Retirement Board the means to more effectively administer the Retirement System and to manage a comprehensive, diversified Retirement Fund.

By any standard, the Retirement System today is a large-scale business enterprise. In addition to administering a number of comprehensive pension plans covering over 35,000 active and retired members, Retirement Board members serve as fiduciaries of a pension fund whose assets exceed $1.6 billion. The effective management of that fund, in competition with similar funds throughout the United States, requires substantial pension plan and investment management experience and expertise.

The Retirement Board, in its role as fiduciaries of the fund, acts in the capacity of trust and is accountable for the breach of that trust. It is therefore essential that the Board possess the authority to appoint and remove at its pleasure a General Manager and a Chief Investment Officer who shall carry out and implement Board policies on the management and disposition of plan funds.

As a matter of record, although the current charter provides for the civil service appointment of a Secretary-General Manager, the position, since its inception in 1922, has never been filled by the civil service process. In addition, of the 16 board and commissions in City and County Service whose members are appointed by the Mayor, the Retirement Board is the only Board that lacks authority to appoint its chief executive officer; all other chief executive officers serve at the pleasure of the respective boards and commissions.

Proposition G will provide the Retirement Board an effective tool in evaluating the on-going management of the System and the performance of the all-important investment fund. The Legislature of the State of California, recognizing the same needs for the State Public Employees’ Retirement System fund, has placed on the June 1984 state ballot a similar proposition.

The Retirement Board, Mayor Dianne Feinstein, the Board of Supervisors and the Civil Service Commission support Proposition G.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition G was just defeated by the voters in 1982. It shouldn’t be on the ballot again. This is another example of hoping to wear the voters out. The Charter was amended to make the head of the Retirement System part of the Civil Service System. Instead of holding a civil service test in the past two years to re-place the retired incumbent who gave notice two years ago, this measure is placed on the ballot. The Retirement System Board already was given the power to pick any one of the top three people who place on the civil service test. Don’t weaken our city’s merit system. Vote NO on Proposition G.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on Proposition G!

For good government, let’s keep these two positions under place. Civil Service.

Republican County Central Committee

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Apply now in Room 158 City Hall
Bilingual persons are particularly needed
PROPOSITION H

Shall the authority to combine the Office of the Recorder with the Office of the Registrar of Voters be eliminated and the Recorder made a separate officer of the City under the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 240

NO 241

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under the City Charter, the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters are two separate offices. The Chief Administrative Officer can appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters. Currently, one person holds both offices.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would require that the Recorder be a separate officer of the city and county under the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer could not appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Recorder to be a separate officer of the city and county.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to have the power to appoint one person to serve as both the Recorder and the Registrar of Voters.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On Feb. 27 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the supervisors voted “No”.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H: “Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.

If possible, please vote in the middle of the day.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H creates a separate position for the Recorder. Until now, the Registrar of Voters, who also serves as Recorder, has made those duties his lowest priority. Proposition H will take the Recorder’s duties out of the realm of the Registrar of Voters—where they never belonged in the first place. The Recorder will be an independent office and directly responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

This reorganization is necessary to insure good government.

The Recorder’s office collects $13,000,000 annually. Last year it became apparent that the office was mishandled and poorly managed. San Francisco cannot afford to have such an important office go unsupervised. Establishing a separate position of Recorder is a logical method of improving accountability and streamlining the operation. It will not cost citizens anything and will greatly increase the quality of service.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

As it is now, the same person holds the offices of Recorder and Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco. This official juggles both jobs simultaneously, and not always satisfactorily. Late last year there were disclosures of copious problems encountered by citizens attempting to record real estate documents, and revelations that the Registrar of Voters was spending but 10% of his time managing the Recorder’s Office. Proposition H would separate the Office of the Recorder from the Registrar of Voters and make one person in charge of that office as Recorder. The Recorder would be accountable directly to the Chief Administrative Officer.

The Recorder’s job is vital to our City. It is simply illogical to lump the Recorder with the Registrar of Voters. Administering elections is different than managing an office which deals with often complex real estate transactions. It’s like mixing apples and oranges. The Recorder collects approximately $13,000,000 each year. The job is too important to be allowed to take a back seat to the City’s elections office. It is in the best interest of a well run city that the Recorder’s office be carefully, independently administered on a full time basis and not neglected. Giving direct responsibility for its operation to the Chief Administrative Officer will insure that the office functions efficiently and serves the City in the best way possible.

Proposition H will make city government more effective and eliminate “red tape”, delays and legal disputes about the recording of documents by citizens.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Vote NO on Proposition H!

There is no compelling reason to separate these two positions.

Republican County Central Committee

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

Your application must be received at least one week before election day.

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall the Board of Supervisors be reduced from eleven members to nine members following the November 1984 election and be further reduced to seven members following the November 1986 election, and shall elections for Supervisors be changed from even-numbered to odd-numbered years? 

YES 244

NO 245

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are eleven members on the Board of Supervisors. Elections for supervisor are held at the general election in November of every even-numbered year. Six members will be elected in November 1984 for a four-year term. Five members will be elected in November 1986 for a four-year term.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I provides that four supervisors instead of six would be elected in November 1984, each for a three-year term. The November 1984 election would reduce the members from eleven to nine members. In the November 1986 election three supervisors instead of five would be elected for a three-year term. This would reduce the members from nine to seven members. Thereafter, elections for Supervisor would be held in November of every odd-numbered year and each would be elected for four-year terms.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have seven members, elected in odd-numbered years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to continue to have eleven members, elected in even-numbered years.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

"Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on 1983-84 salary and staffing levels, the cost of government could be reduced by approximately $331,000 per year when the measure is fully implemented in 1987."

How “I” Got on Ballot

On October 22, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for a seven member Board of Supervisors had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 31,354 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 22.

A check of each of the signatures showed that 23,401 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,834 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION I BEGINS ON PAGE 50

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

WARNING TO VOTERS:

Don’t be impressed by prominent names and groups opposing Proposition “I”.

Most of those people and organizations are subject to political arm-twisting or have their own fingers in the “BIG PIE” at City Hall.

Reducing the Board of Supervisors to seven members will save YOU $500,000 yearly. Save taxes. Cut waste. Vote “YES”.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN LEADERS AGREE:

Despite City Hall pressure, the Republican Central Committee on 3/21/84 wisely refused to endorse the tax-wasting eleven member Board of Supervisors.

Save $500,000 YEARLY and dramatically cut City Hall staff with a cost-effective seven member Board. Remember, all fifty-seven other California counties have but five Supervisors.

Irresponsible Board actions include their notorious commendation of Joseph Knute Burke, Consul General of murderous, COMMUNIST Grenada. American marines later died to liberate Grenada.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

We agree with the “PROGRESS” editorial favoring reduction of this Board!

Robert Guichard
Citizens For Better Government Chairman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Central Committeeman
State Assembly Candidate
George Rehmer
Citizens For Better Government Treasurer
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican Central Committeeman

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

REPUBLICAN FORUM ENDORSES:

San Francisco Republican Forum endorses YES on “I” (to save $500,000 yearly by reducing the Board of Supervisors).

Elect President Ronald Reagan, Tom Spinosa for Congress,

and Max Woods and Robert Silvestri for State Assembly.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

For 10 years, San Francisco has been politically torn apart by seven propositions changing the rules on how we elect our Board of Supervisors. These conflicting propositions have pitted San Franciscans against San Franciscans. Stop this needless turmoil by voting NO on Proposition I.

Continuous attempts to change the election rules have disrupted the orderly working of our legislative body. Candidates for election focus on short-term political gains. Thoughtful and coherent long-range policies for the overall good of the city are lost in the concern for campaigning. City Hall must be allowed to focus on managing our great city, and not be distracted by ever-changing rules of running for office. We are proud of our ethnic, cultural and social diversity. This diversity makes San Francisco great. An eleven member Board of Supervisors provides greater opportunity for this diversity to be represented.

Eliminate political turmoil and disruption. Support a Board that is more responsive and representative of a cosmopolitan city.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

John H. Jacobs
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.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Once again, a small band of political opportunists is trying to change the way we elect the Board of Supervisors.

In just the fourteen years since my election to the Board, there have been ten ballot measures to change the method of election to the Board. This constant pulling and tugging has created divisions within our City and undermined the stability of government.

Now, again, this year, another attempt is being made drastically to alter our system of representative government. This latest charter revision would reduce the number of Supervisors from eleven to seven. Not only is it bad legislation, but it is undemocratic and unfair.

Vote No on Proposition "I".

Additionally, Proposition "I" would shift elections from even-numbered years, when major state and national candidates and issues are on the ballot, to odd-numbered years, when voter turnout historically is lowest. This is a blatant power-grab to limit voting to the smallest number of voters possible, all so they can be more easily targeted and manipulated by high-powered campaign tactics.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

Proposition "I" would concentrate power in fewer hands, and give greater authority to the small special interests who can back their chosen candidates with big contributions. Many neighborhoods now represented on the Board would be voiceless, and whole sectors of our City would effectively be unrepresented.

Vote NO on Proposition "I".

The proponents throw up a smoke screen that the proposition would save money, as if democratic rights should be bargained in dollars. Their bluff is that the favored seven supervisors would need less staff, when, in fact, they would have much more work to do and would be clamoring for more staff.

We need a stable and truly representative City and County government. This initiative will be disruptive, divisive, and reduce representation.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition "I".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Good government — government that pays attention to the people who pay for it and serves their needs — requires citizen participation. Taxpayers and voters have a right to reach their elected officials when they need help, and to participate in making the decisions that affect them.

We urge you to VOTE NO on Proposition I. This harmful proposition will severely limit citizen participation in government in many important ways.

Proposition I would move the time we elect Supervisors to years when a much smaller number of people vote. That means that many voters will be excluded from electing Supervisors, and will lose control over the decisions those Supervisors make. City policies and programs will be set by a minority of San Franciscans.

Because San Francisco is a City and County, our Board of Supervisors is charged with many more responsibilities than any other Board or City Council in the State. Reducing the number of our Board members will make it more difficult to take care of the combined responsibilities of our Board. The voters will have fewer of their problems taken care of by a Board too small to handle an overload of business.

Proposition I would also eliminate staff of the Board responsible for solving the many day-to-day problems that taxpayers and voters call City Hall for help with. Right now, when a San Franciscan needs contact with a member of the Board to discuss a problem or law, they have access to their offices. If Proposition I passes, it will be more and more difficult to talk with members of the Board, and the Board’s decisions will be less reflective of the voters’ thinking.

The goal of our city government should be to make sure all San Franciscans have a voice at City Hall, working to solve their problems. But the smaller the Board of Supervisors, the less likely that all points of view will be represented.

To assure a government with the strength to manage our problems, and keep all citizens involved in running our city, VOTE NO on Proposition I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

NO ON PROP I

Less supervisors means less access and thus less representation for you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Vote No on Prop I.

San Francisco Police Officers’ Assn.
Reduce Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I hope that all responsible San Francisco citizens will vote against Proposition I.

This disruptive Initiative will damage the stability of the Board of Supervisors. It will severely limit the ability of minority communities to receive fair representation.

The initiative also limits the current inadequate part-time character of the Board. To reduce the number of members to seven part-time positions would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the Board.

Our City and County needs a full-time, not part-time, hardworking Board of Supervisors, committed to serving the needs of San Francisco.

I urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Wendy Nelder
President, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

In the last ten years San Francisco voters have voted seven times on how to elect a Board of Supervisors. The current system of eleven members elected at large is consistent with political tradition and affords adequate representation for this, the only consolidated city and county in California.

As someone who has served 13 years on our Board of Supervisors and notwithstanding the sincere intent of the proponents to save money on the operation of the Board, I intend to vote "NO" on Proposition I.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Everything about this Proposition is contrary to the fair thinking of San Francisco's voters.

The people behind this proposition aren't telling the truth about what they want to do to our city. In addition to reducing the Board of Supervisors to a nine-person body, they want to elect Supervisors in off-election years, when a significantly smaller number of San Franciscans vote. That means that our Supervisors, and the decisions they make, will not reflect the thinking of most San Franciscans.

Proposition I means San Franciscans won't be well represented on the Board of Supervisors. Reducing the number of Supervisors reduces the likelihood that all San Franciscans will have a voice on the Board of Supervisors. While San Franciscans are justly proud of the diversity of our city, representation of the different groups that make up our city's ethnic, minority, neighborhood and small business — would become virtually impossible.

Proposition I means city government won't work as well. By eliminating four members of the Board of Supervisors, the crush of city business will take over, and we will see a decline in the way our city runs. Proposition I won't make our Supervisors work full-time. Seven Supervisors just can't run a city as large and complex as San Francisco.

Proposition I will result in chaos and instability in government. In the last ten years, San Franciscans have changed the way we elect Supervisors seven times. It's time to give our system a chance to work, and stop the interruptions that keep the Supervisors from doing the work we elected them to do.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I

Congresswoman Sala Burton
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Harry Kartsonis
Supervisor Ed Reiskin
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Michael Hennessey, San Francisco
C. A. L. C. President, President, S. F. Police Officers' Assn.
S. F. Democratic County Central Committee
Nancy Pelosi
Gail Moscone
Bob McDonnell, Laborers Local 261
Paul Varriacci, Executive Director, SEIU Local 500
Louise Unglen, President, State of National Women's Political Caucus
San Francisco Tomorrow
Walter F. Johnson, President, Dept. Store Employees Local 1109
John Maher
Sue Homner, member, San Francisco Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

I urge you to vote No on Proposition I.

Gerald J. Schmidt
Member - San Francisco Police Department

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

WE URGE YOU TO VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I.

Elizabeth Anello
John Bartis, Former Member Board of Supervisors*
Stafford Buckley
Robert Canting, Vice-chair, CED*
Marie Cleasby
Eric Craven
Gwenn Craig, Co-chair, National Assn. of Gay & Lesbian Democratic Clubs.*
Sonia Dale, President, Friends of Noe Valley*
Douglas Engmann, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals*
Jim Faye, San Francisco Tenants Union*
Jim Foster
Charles Gale, member, John Muir Tenants*
Jeff Greendorfer
Rona Guy, Co-Director, Women’s Foundation*
John Holtzclaw, Chair, S.F. Bay Chapter, Sierra Club*
Agar Jacks
David and Edith Jenkins
Marie Johling
Rodney Johnson
Joseph Kellifer, S.F. Tenants Union*
Tony Kitroy, President, San Francisco Tomorrow*
Margel Kaufman
Steven M. Krefting, President, S.F. League of Environmental Voters*
Joseph P. Lacey, Chairman, Old St. Mary’s Housing Committee*
Toby Levine
Richard Livingston, Administrator, Cadillac Hotel*
Mitchell Omerberg, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sun Palomares-Criollo
Walter Park, Director, Independent Housing Services*
Bradford Paul, Planner, North of Market Planning Coalition*
Linda Post, Chair, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee*
George M. Raya
Jean Ross, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Sal Roselli, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club*
Tessa Rouvel
Tom Saunders
Sun Shields
Marion Sills
Arthur Simon
Peter Stern
Doris Thomas, Amt. Assistant to Congressman Sala Burton*
Mary Vail
Don Van Gorder
Calvin Welch, Citizens for Representative Government*
Esther “B” Woeste, CLU*
Polly Marshall, Member, Affordable Housing Alliance*
Manara Kealey
Dennis A. Ammerson
Bette Wallace Landis, Democratic Women’s Forum*
*Identification only.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

As members of the REPUBLICAN PARTY, we strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition “I”.

With the Board of Supervisors reduced from seven to eleven, membership on the Board will be far less diverse and representative of San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Prop “I”.

Dolph Andrews, Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Robert R. Bocci, Secretary, Republican County Central Committee*

Wally Myers, Chairman, Bay Area Republican Caucus*
Chris Bowman, 2nd Vice-President, Concerned Republicans for Individual Rights*
M. Lester O’Shea, Former Chairman, Republican County Central Committee*
Beverly A. Whaley, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Marilyn C. Case, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Wayne Y. Yee, Alternate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Christine Wilkins, Associate member, Republican County Central Committee*
Donald W. Bowden, Jr., Member, Republican County Central Committee*
Gordon A. Blyer, Member, Republican County Central Committee*
*Identification purposes only

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

We live in San Francisco, love the City, and want to have our businesses prosper here. We believe that stable and representative government is essential to the continued economic health of our City.

The current structure of the Board of Supervisors — with eleven members — best serves economic and civic health. The City’s finances are sound. Our economy continues to:

• grow
• provide jobs
• raise the tax revenues our government needs

Yet another attempt to alter the form and election of the Board of Supervisors threatens this stability and prosperity.

We join the many other San Franciscans who urge you to vote NO on this disruptive and destructive proposition.

Morris Bernstein
William Coblenz
Jerome Adams
Timothy Tosta
Louis Giraudo
Henry Berman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

It is in the city’s best interest to VOTE NO on Proposition I. Small businesses in San Francisco need a stable, representative and hard-working Board of Supervisors. But Proposition I would throw our city government into turmoil.

By making the Board of Supervisors smaller, we would reduce the chance that our neighborhoods, and the small businesses that serve them, will have a person to take care of our needs in City Hall.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

June 5, 1984 Primary Election

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:  
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:  

Please mail ballot to me at:  
Por favor enviéme la balota por correo:

Please mail ballot to me at:  
Por favor enviéme la balota por correo:

Mailing address, if different from above Dirección Postal (si es diferente)

PRINTED NAME-LETROS DE IMPRENTA-  正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申請人簽名

DATE-FECHA- 日期

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION- 住址:

TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

Description of Handicap/Disability  
Voter's Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente:

Descripción del Impedimento/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante

FOREIGNER ABSENTEE VOTER
本人在此於舊金山市縣申請永久缺席選票。根據選舉法典第
一四五一段的規定，我在此聲明我申請成為永久缺席選票的原由.

說明殘障情形及性質
選民姓名
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION? (¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1984
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 29 DE MAYO DE 1984,
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
Make Your Vote Truly Count—Support The Republican Party!

Your vote is critical – but it is just one vote!

Why not make it multiply (and help your candidates win) by sending a few dollars now to the Republican Party's Victory Fund and/or volunteer a few hours of your time as we head into the November elections?

In addition to Ronald Reagan, every Republican candidate who wins in the June primary will depend heavily on us to provide the campaign services and resources they need for victory. Send us $15 or $20 now, and we'll have the funds on hand to pay for advertising, polling and get-out-the-vote mailings, and statewide organization.

Your check now means we can reach hundreds more voters, just as we have reached you. Won't you please help? Lift this flap now and show your support for the entire Republican team!
Reduce Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors needs to be able to do its job without constant interruptions in the way it is elected. And it needs 11 members to have time and resources to make sure our neighborhoods' small businesses get the city services and police protection they need.

Vote NO on Proposition I.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Our Board of Supervisors can only do its work for the people of the city if it is large enough and has the staff to assure that our complex city government is well run. That job requires eleven members.

The best way to get a hard-working Board, assuring that all communities receive services they need, is to leave the Board at its current size.

Everyone wants to have a Board that guarantees us good government. The way to build a strong Board is by electing the best possible people to office, not by reducing the number of members.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition I.

Ben Hom
Richard Corbato, Commissioner, Board of Education
Pius Lee
Louis Hop Lee, Member, Civil Service Commission
Ben Tom, Commissioner, Board of Education
Yuri Wada, President, California Board of Regents
Julie Tang, Commissioner, Community College Board
Jeff Mori, Member, Parks and Recreation Commission
Gordon Lau
Jess Esteva

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Each year, the Board of Supervisors must examine many ordinances and funding requests which effect the Hispanic community. We must look to the Board to take the care, time and effort to assure that our community needs are not ignored. Proposition I by radically reducing the number of Supervisors would mean that our needs and concerns would have less of a chance of being heard at City Hall.

We can’t afford to have a Board of Supervisors which spends less time on our community’s interests. The problems of affordable housing, transportation, police services and other community issues would take a back seat at a seven member board. Reduced members would mean that public hearings would not take place. We would have to fight twice as hard just to preserve basic services.

San Francisco needs a Board of Supervisors which represents all of our diverse communities. Proposition I rejects this diversity in favor of short-sighted, narrow political interests.

Proposition I is a bad idea for all San Franciscans, and an even worse idea for the Hispanic community. Vote NO on PROPOSITION I.

Ernest C. Ayala, Commissioner, Community College Board
Carlota Texidor del Porritto, Member, Civil Service Commission
Clemente Obregon
Al Borvice, Attorney at Law
Jim Morales
Ralph Hurtado

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is a direct attack on democracy.

Through many years of hard fought election battles, the diverse segments of our community have been able to work together to elect a Board of Supervisors that reflects the character of our City. Proposition I would destroy this balance.

This proposition would create disunity where harmony now exists. Proposition I challenges the very root of American democracy, which is based on an equal and chance for all citizens to participate as elected members of our government.

The real purpose of Proposition I is to deny whole segments of our City fair representation in City Hall, and concentrate authority in the hands of a few power brokers. Proposition I would place the well-funded, special interest candidates in a better position than the community-oriented candidates, who must depend on small contributions and volunteers to get elected.

We urge all San Franciscans who care about preserving equal access to the political process to vote NO on Proposition I.

Welton Flynn, President, Black Leadership Forum
Willie L. Brown, Speaker of the California Assembly
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Dr. Zarelli L. Goodye, Member, Airports Commission
Betty Brooks, Member, Housing Authority
Dr. Solomon Wilson, Member, Board of Education
Black Leadership Forum

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

We urge all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition I.

The people behind Proposition I are hiding their real purpose — to keep thousands of San Franciscans from voting for the Board of Supervisors.

Proposition I would move elections from even numbered years to odd numbered years when the electorate is significantly smaller, and less reflective of the thinking of all San Franciscans.

Proposition I will give us a Board of Supervisors less progress-}

ive in thinking, less inclined to pass important civil rights legis-}
lation and provide needed social services and community health programs.

If Proposition I passes, many different groups — women, minorities, and gays — will be left without adequate representa-

tion on the Board and without city services they deserve.

Submitted by Harvey Milk Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Carole Migden
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

San Francisco is a city with a diverse population. Reducing the number of Supervisors would decrease the chances of Labor, Minorities, Women and Neighborhoods to be represented on the Board. Keep our tradition of fairness, VOTE NO on PROP "I"

Jim Wachob - President
District Eight Democratic Club

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

2.100 Composition and Salary

The board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000.

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board until 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and the supervisor who receives the highest number of votes at the general municipal election held in 1987 and at the election held every two years thereafter shall serve as president of the board for a two-year term commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1988. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide:

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, eleven members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1985, the board of supervisors shall consist of nine members elected at large and at 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1987, the board of supervisors shall consist of seven members elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected for a term of four years, from commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, at the general election in 1984 there shall be elected four members of the board of supervisors to succeed those six members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985. The respective term of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1984, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1987, and every fourth year thereafter, successors to said four members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years. At the general election in 1986 there shall be elected three members of the board of supervisors to succeed

(Continued on page 63)
PROPOSITION J

Shall San Francisco adopt an ordinance providing for the collection of costs of incarceration in a county jail or other local detention facility from a defendant whom the Court finds financially able to pay?

YES 249
NO 250

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law says that when someone serves time in a county jail after conviction of a crime, the court may order the person to pay all or part of what it costs to keep him in jail, depending on his ability to pay. This law does not apply locally, however, unless a local ordinance is adopted. San Francisco has not adopted this ordinance.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would adopt an ordinance to put this state law into effect in San Francisco. The ordinance puts the Director of the Adult Probation Department in charge of setting up and administering the program in the county.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the court to be able to order someone who has been convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in a county jail, if the person has the financial ability to pay.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t want the court to be able to order someone convicted of a crime to pay all or part of the costs of his stay in the county jail.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On September 20, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition calling for prisoners to reimburse the City for the cost of incarceration had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Quentin Kopp, the proponent of the petition, had gathered 12,400 signatures which he turned in to the Registrar on September 7.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,620 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there could be an increase in revenues, the amount of which, being dependent on each inmate’s ability to pay, cannot be determined at this time.”

THE LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION J APPEARS ON PAGE 53

YOUR POLLING PLACE LOCATION IS ON THE ADDRESS LABEL ON THE BACK COVER
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Many people who are convicted of misdemeanors and are serving time in the county jail can afford to repay the taxpayers of San Francisco for what it costs to confine them at our expense. Sure, some people are unable to pay, and shouldn’t have to pay, but there are many others who can.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
There is no reason why law-abiding citizens should put up with the hazards of drunk drivers, and then have to pay for their time in jail when they themselves can afford to pay. Other counties in California have passed such a law after the legislature in 1982 gave counties the power to do so, including Alameda and Los Angeles — and it’s working! As the author of this initiative, I respectfully urge you to vote YES on Proposition J — Let’s put this sensible law into action in San Francisco.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Each year, it costs the taxpayers of San Francisco $22,000,000 to keep convicted criminals in the county jail. While many of them cannot afford to pay the $47,000 a night the Sheriff certifies it costs to be there, some convicts can. Proposition J will allow San Francisco to charge convicted prisoners what it costs to keep them in jail when a judge decides they’re able to pay.

Even if the plan doesn’t result in a lot of money, it makes an important point. Convicted lawbreakers should help pay the costs instead of making taxpayers pay their penalties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Cheryl Arenson

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

In 1982, the California Legislature authorized every county in California to adopt an ordinance requiring county jail prisoners who are financially able to do so to reimburse taxpayers for the cost of confinement. Prisoners who can’t afford to would be exempt from paying. People convicted of misdemeanors, like drunk driving and other charges, who have the financial capacity to pay, should reimburse the taxpayer.

Over 15,000 San Francisco voters had to sign initiative petitions to secure enactment of a law which other major counties in California have adopted by single vote of their Board of Supervisors. San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors had to be different, however. Our Board of Supervisors refused to enact such a law because Supervisors Britt, Hongisto, Kennedy, Mahler, Renne, Silver, Walker and Ward voted against it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

It is unfair for taxpayers to bear the burden of incarceration costs for prisoners who are capable financially.

John Barbagelata
Donald W. Boden
Daniel G. Gillham
Oscar Sutro

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Proposition J would allow San Francisco to recover the costs of housing prisoners. The decision to determine if a prisoner can pay, and how much, would be left to the judge as part of sentencing.

Some people argue that most prisoners are poor and the amount of money raised by such a program would be insignificant. Proposition J would not require people who do not have the money, to pay. But business and professional people who drink and drive, or commit other crimes, will find that they must pay San Franciscans for their wrongdoing.

As much as $100,000 a year could be generated by charging prisoners room and board. And while this may seem like a small amount compared to the entire cost of running a jail, it could free scarce city funds for other services, like parks, libraries, repair of potholes and more police.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Arthur B. Uland
Angela Barbagelata
Wallace A. Myers
Madeline A. Case

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would require people convicted of crimes to pay for all or part of the costs of their incarceration based on their ability to do so. Taxpayers can't be expected to go picking up the tab after tab.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

People of means who can well afford to pay for their time in jail are being convicted for drunk driving, white collar and other types of crimes. The average cost to taxpayers for someone in the county jail is $47,000 per day. It's only logical that financially able people pay for their own keep when they're convicted of crimes and not make taxpayers foot the bill.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Martha Gillham
Beverly Ann Grove
H.P. Wright
Walter Domeniconi

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION J

NOTE: All sections are new.

AMENDING ARTICLE V, CHAPTER 10, OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10.39-2 THERETO TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN A COUNTY JAIL OR OTHER LOCAL DETENTION FACILITY.

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

Section 1. Article V, Chapter 10, of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Section 10.39-2 thereto, reading as follows:

Sec. 10.39-2 Director of Adult Probation Department to Recover Costs of Incarceration.

The director of the adult probation department is designated as the county officer of San Francisco responsible for collection of monies ordered by the courts pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code, and shall make inquiry into the ability of the defendant to pay all or a portion of the costs of incarceration, develop a scale for determining a defendant's ability to pay such costs, develop payment schedules, receive payments, and deposit into the general fund through the county treasurer any funds determined by a court to be the amounts to be reimbursed by such defendant to the county in a manner in which the court believes reasonable and compatible with the defendant's financial ability.

The director of the adult probation department shall base the costs of incarceration, including costs of booking, upon a determination made by the Sheriff and approved by the controller, to be reviewed annually by the board of supervisors, of the average per-day costs of incarceration in the county jail or other local detention facility. The board of supervisors may adopt such further legislation as is necessary to effectuate the purpose of this ordinance, but not to repeal the collection of monies pursuant to Section 1203.1c of the California Penal Code.

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 K**

Shall an ordinance be adopted prohibiting building permits for certain structures which will cast a substantial shadow on Recreation and Park Department property, except on prior approval of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the ordinance, with certain exceptions?

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City Planning Commission sometimes asks a developer to modify plans for a building if it blocks the sunlight in recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. But no permanent standards exist for this now.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition K says the City Planning Commission may not approve any building project which causes significant shading of recreational areas like parks and playgrounds. Exceptions would include certain projects in progress, buildings less than 40 feet high, buildings constructed for recreational or park-related purposes, or buildings which only cause shade during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset. Also, any building already constructed when this ordinance goes into effect could be rebuilt to the same height in the same location, if the need arises.

A **YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to require the City Planning Commission to reject any building project which causes significant shading of a park or playground.

A **NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the City Planning Commission to set up these permanent standards for shading of recreational areas.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “K”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K: “Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it should have no impact on the cost of government. However, as a result of its possible future application certain costs may be incurred, the amount of which can not be determined at this time.”

---

**How “K” Got on Ballot**

On March 14, an ordinance signed by several supervisors was delivered to the Registrar of Voters with instructions that it be placed on the ballot. A copy of that ordinance appears at the end of this pamphlet.

The City Charter allows four or more supervisors to submit an ordinance to the voters by signing their names to it and delivering it to the Registrar. Ordinances submitted in this manner need not go through the legislative process.

The Park Shadowing Ordinance was signed by Supervisors Nancy Walker, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Doris Ward, Willie Kennedy, Harry Britt, Louise Renne and Bill Maher.

---

**NOTE:** YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Preserve sunlight in the parks; vote YES on Proposition “K”.
Support Proposition “K”.
San Francisco is a beautiful City. It was built with care by people with foresight and concern, with an appreciation of human needs.
This tradition has been carried on in the repair of the cable cars, the restoration of Golden Gate Park, the passage of Proposition “J” to acquire and maintain adequate open space, and in overwhelmingly passing a Charter amendment to protect playgrounds and parks from sale without public consent.

We have dealt with the need to maintain ownership of our open spaces, but we need to protect the public’s right to enjoy those spaces. There was recently a major battle over sunlight in Chinese Playground. Now there are problems at other parks, including Union Square, Portsmouth Square and several others.
No one goes to the park to sit in the shade and get windburn.
To take the sunlight out of our parks in shortsighted environmental vandalism. Dark parks are dead parks.

Support our parks! Support our heritage! Support Proposition “K”. Vote YES on Proposition “K”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION K!
A “YES” vote on Proposition K is a vote for sunshine. Pure and simple. It will assure that the precious legacy of this City’s green parks and open spaces is handed on to our children.
The measure would establish an ordinance outlawing all structures over 40 feet in height which cast shade on City parks and all Recreation and Park Commission property during any but the first and last hours of the day.

Our park space should be protected for all our children, seniors, those who enjoy spending their lunch hours in our downtown public squares and all who enjoy our parks.

I urge all voters to join me in keeping our parks and public squares warm and bright.

John L. Molinari
Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco’s Recreation and Park facilities are the “lungs” of the City. Protect these valuable properties from chilling shadows. Vote “YES” on Proposition K.

Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON “K”
San Franciscans spend millions of tax dollars on neighborhood parks. Sunlight, greenery and good recreational equipment are essential components. Recently, some parks have been threatened with shading by highrise buildings. We must have policies to ensure protection from shading parks now and for future generations. PROTECT OUR CITY’S INVESTMENT! Vote YES on Proposition K.

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Willinda McCrea
William Kuhns
Margaret Bruenn
Priscilla H. Brown
Jonathan Bulkeley
Eliza Cahn
Jack Kaiser
Bette Landis
Nancy Larson
Jennie Lewis
Richard Livingston
Bruce Rafael

Robert Cramer
Rev. Henry Davis
Robert Dutra
Rebecca Evans
Amy Meyer
Keith Eickman
Tommy Harris
Frances McAtter
Jeffrey K. Mori
G. Samantha Yucey
Tom Molloy, General Manager

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Dan Sweeney
Jack Tragilo
Jane Winslow
Lottie Lawson
Toby Rosenblatt, Planning Commissioner
Douglas G. Wright, Planning Commissioner
Susan J. Biernack, Planning Commissioner
Jerome H. Klein, Planning Commissioner

Robert Landis, Teacher
Robert Nero
Walter Park
Veronica Huwnicut
Carol Nero
Arden Donakas
Heide Chipp
Tim Lillyquist
Dick Grosboil
John Holzcling

Carl Pope
Miriam Blauenstein
Joyce Hall
Don Goranz
Robert Muchmayer
Stanley J. Herzstein
Anne Halsted
Gordon Chin
Roberto Hernandez
Linda Chapman

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

If we let some developer completely shadow and thereby ruin this existing Chinatown playground, practical “common sense” politics dictates that the taxpayers will inevitably be obliged to buy and build some additional new playgrounds nearby at a cost of millions! Let’s save the taxpayers some money right now, and let the sun continue to shine on our most important product!

CHILDREN! VOTE YES!

William F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
REPUBLICAN COUNTY COMMITTEE MAN.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PROTECT SAN FRANCISCO’S PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS. SAVE OUR SUNLIGHT. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

Vera Haile
Executive Director
North of Market Senior Service Center

Paul E. Andersen
Manager
Mark Twain Hotel
Sarah Kearney
Richard Livingston
Past Presidents
North of Market Planning Coalition
John Fitzgerald
Administrator
St. Bonniface Church
Flora Harvey
Secretary
Cadillac Tenants Association
Leroy Looper
Executive Director
Reality House West
Randy Shaw
Executive Director
Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Brad Paul
Director
North of Market Planning Coalition
Tina Tao
President
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association
Rob Waters
Editor
Tenderloin Times
Barbara Bynik
Executive Director
Hospitality House
Richard Parker
Chairman
William Penn Tenants’ Association
Garth Ferguson
President
The Homeless Caucus
Marvis J. Phillips
Vice Chairman
North of Market Citizens Advisory Committee
Don Feser
President
North of Market Planning Coalition
Catherine A. Merschel
Executive Director
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Nancy L. Hampton
Secretary
Tenderloin Neighborhood Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Unfortunately this measure doesn’t go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction. City Hall has to adopt tougher controls on runaway downtown office growth and on shading of all open spaces. Not just a few as this measure does. Give us our sun. Vote yes on K.

San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth
Sue Hestor
Brad Paul
Ruth Gravanis
David Jones
Tony Kilroy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

YES ON PROPOSITION K

Public parks and open space are essential to all San Franciscans. To achieve their highest use now and for the future, we must ensure that our parks have as much sunlight as possible for as many hours a day as possible.

Protect our parks from further shadows. Vote Yes on “K”.

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

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

Save Our Playgrounds!!! Vote YES on Proposition “K.”

Dr. Terence Faulkner Republican Central Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Our city’s parks and playgrounds are among our most precious possessions, oases in a busy city. We must preserve and protect them. However, Proposition K is not the best way to protect our parks from shadows cast by tall buildings. Sunlight in parks is not the only issue facing San Francisco — other concerns, such as jobs, affordable housing, better and more parks and playgrounds should have at least equal footing in building permit decisions. Proposition K would rob our planning process of needed flexibility and cast into law a rigid formula which will not necessarily be the best thing for our parks or the people who use them. Proposition K could not be changed except by another vote of the electorate, which makes it doubly inflexible.

In public testimony both the City Planning Director and the Recreation and Parks General Manager stated that they would prefer a situation which would allow them maximum flexibility in dealing with sunlight in parks as well as other factors affecting our urban environment.

Let’s approach the park shadowing problem with a city planning code amendment that would allow city officials to negotiate the best possible deal for the parks — and the people — of San Francisco. It’s entirely within our power to stop skyscrapers from spoiling our sunny parks and playgrounds. Let’s do it in the most intelligent, advantageous way possible.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

I grew up in San Francisco; my children are growing up here. All of us love San Francisco’s many parks and open spaces — and we certainly want them to have adequate sunlight. However, Proposition K is not the way to achieve this goal.

Proposition K is bad policy because:

1. Proposition K could prevent construction of apartments and other buildings many blocks away from a park because during morning and evening hours even a four-story apartment building will cast long shadows. Proposition K means less housing, fewer jobs and less economic growth for San Francisco.

2. Proposition K would hobble creation of new parks; since neighboring property owners would fight to avoid its restrictions.

3. Proposition K mainly benefits a few downtown parks, some of which are used only by office workers for a few hours on weekdays. But Proposition K will cost San Francisco residents millions of dollars, because property owners whose property is taken by Proposition K will sue the City and recover for their loss. Money that should be devoted to vital City services, including maintenance and improvement of parks throughout the City, adding new parks and playgrounds in our residential areas, and repairing the potholes in our streets, will vanish under a tide of litigation. Our entire City surplus of more than $100 million could evaporate under this burden, so thoughtlessly imposed by advocates of Proposition K. The hard-earned tax dollars of San Franciscans should not be squandered in this way.

4. Proposition K elevates sunlight in parks above all other social and economic issues. This is not sound policy. San Francisco has many problems — affordable housing, sufficient jobs, minority advancement, to name a few. In deciding whether new residential or other buildings should be built, these concerns, as well as sunlight in parks, should be taken into account. Proposition K is inflexible and cannot be changed without another vote of the people. Its many faults will be very difficult to correct.

Please vote “NO” on Proposition K.

Wendy Nelder
President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

This is a well-intended measure. However, it is the wrong means to achieve a laudable end. The undersigned supports the end, but not the means, which are counter-productive. First, in the opinion of the City Planning Director, this measure will preclude negotiation with property owners to add sunlight to city parks. An initiative ordinance is inflexible, unlike a regular planning ordinance which is adopted only after adequate, open, public hearing before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, after proper public notification. If future prob-
Park Shadow Ban

problems occur, amendments can be made, problems adjusted. For example, Proposition K would exempt 40-foot buildings. However, even 40-foot buildings can cast shadows in open areas in early morning and late afternoon, particularly during low sun periods in winter months.

VOTE NO ON “K”

Secondly, some developments over 40 feet are exempted from this measure and others are not. Thirdly, the measure also ignores steps by builders to mitigate shadows.

As an initiative ordinance (by Supervisors, not by voter signatures, incidentally) Proposition K sidesteps public hearings and freezes planning requirements into formulae.

I pledge support to a regular planning ordinance to enhance sunlight in City parks which is now almost ready for enactment, not something which shuts out the public and can have an opposite effect than that which is intended.

Let’s do it right — Vote NO on K.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

We encourage a NO vote on Proposition K.

To protect public open spaces from shadows, San Francisco’s architecture, business and development communities support reasonable and technically workable sunlight access regulations. And such regulations are included in the Department of City Planning’s Downtown Plan.

The Department of City Planning and University of California’s School of Environmental Design constructed a precise model of San Francisco to establish sunlight preservation rules for all downtown public open spaces and shopping streets. These regulations have been thoroughly tested in the university’s simulation laboratory. The Downtown Plan’s sunlight access rules are based upon this careful analysis.

The Downtown Plan’s innovative sunlight preservation regulations are nationally recognized. These regulations have not been incorporated in Proposition K, a poorly analyzed and technically flawed proposition. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Proposition K is a well intentioned but badly written law which opposes and conflicts with critical urban and building design portions of the Downtown Plan.

Without a shadow of a doubt, Proposition K is faulty public policy. Show your support for strong and responsible sunlight preservation rules by voting NO on Proposition K.

John H. Jacobs
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is unnecessary, inconsistent and confusing.

This ill-conceived measure would allow, indeed encourage, the development of a 39-foot building that will completely shade a children’s playground — all day. At the same time, Proposition K would not permit construction of a four-story apartment building a full block away from a park and recreation gymnasium if it casts even a partial shadow on the gymnasium for only 3 hours a day, a few days during the year. In a city facing a major rental housing crisis, Proposition K is a ridiculous idea. Vote NO on K.

If the objectives of Proposition K were included in the city planning code where they belong, we would not have conflicts between sunlight and jobs, sunlight and housing, sunlight and city revenues, sunlight and parks. Vote NO on K.

Proposition K will destroy our progress toward a more livable city. Imagine San Francisco without landmarks like Mission Dolores, Coit Tower, Ghirardelli Square, City College, City Hall, Park Merced Apartments, and the St. Francis Hotel. Proposition K would prevent their being built today. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco is a city that is “supposed” to know how. Passing hastily prepared, poorly thought out ordinances only invites lawsuits — lawsuits that will be contested at taxpayer expense. It is not the way to build a better city. Vote NO on K.

San Francisco Coalition of Business and Labor
Lex Byers
Executive Director

Polls open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m.
If possible, please vote in the middle of the day
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: The entire section is new.

8.407-1 Prevailing Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions
(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of charter section 8.401, 8.403, 8.404, 8.405, 8.407 or any other section of this charter, except sections 8.345 and 8.346, the board of supervisors by ordinance may grant to persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco fringe benefits or working conditions of any nature, except wages and retirement allowances, if such benefits or working conditions are substantially comparable to those provided to not less than 50% of the employees in the applicable civil service classifications or positions in the jurisdictions covered by the salary survey which the civil service commission conducts pursuant to charter section 8.407 and to subsection (b) hereof.
(b) The civil service commission shall conduct a survey of benefits and working conditions for persons employed by the City and County of San Francisco whose salaries are not set pursuant to section 8.407, which is comparable to the survey conducted pursuant to section 8.407. The board of supervisors by ordinance may grant fringe benefits and working conditions to such persons under the same conditions as specified in subsection (a) for employees covered under section 8.407.
(c) Fringe benefits or working conditions granted by ordinance of the board of supervisors pursuant to this section shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding fiscal year if adopted on or before April 1st of any year.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

8.451 Police Department
(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.
(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.
(j) Any member who actually performs services between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. shall be entitled to an additional 6.25% of the compensation otherwise payable for the base pay thereof for all such hours worked; provided, however, that such additional compensation shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984.

PROPOSITION C, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 35

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of $15.00 per month now provided in subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation variable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco,
to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

(c) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the 1st day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance, (1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, strokers, fillermen, truckmen, or hosenmen, in the San Francisco fire department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, or firemen; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the
percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding citywide election. If in the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, members of the fire department employed in the entry rank thereof (H-2) who have completed specified years of satisfactory service shall be entitled to additional compensation as herein provided.

Service shall not qualify as "satisfactory" if the member has been suspended or otherwise disciplined pursuant to the authority granted in section 8.343 during the five year period immediately preceding initial qualification for the additional compensation provided for herein. Any member who shall be so suspended or otherwise disciplined while receiving such additional compensation shall cease to be entitled thereto for a period of two years from the date of decision by the chief of department or the fire commission as appropriate.

Additional compensation as herein provided shall not be included for purposes of retirement benefit calculation or contributions provided elsewhere in this charter.

In determining the years of service necessary to qualify for additional compensation as provided herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as amended shall be given full credit and allowed.

(1) Upon the completion of ten and until the completion of fifteen years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 2 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(2) Upon the completion of fifteen and until the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 5 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

(3) Upon the completion of twenty years of aggregate service, an amount equal to 7 1/2 percent above the rates of compensation as defined and provided for this section shall be paid;

The provisions of this sub-section shall become effective in the manner provided by law, but in no event prior to July 1, 1984. Thereafter entitlement to additional compensation as herein provided shall commence with the beginning of the pay period immediately following the completion of the prescribed periods of service.

PROPOSITION E, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 37

ties owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereafter issued by the city and county for Hetch Hetchy purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by the Hetch Hetchy revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient for, the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407 (e).

7.313 Hetch Hetchy Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, financing, constructing, improving or developing water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under its Hetch Hetchy project, under such terms and conditions as the commissioner may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.
(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the Hetch Hetchy project or from water and power facilities operated or controlled by it.
(c) Hetch Hetchy revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing Hetch Hetchy water facilities or electric power facilities or combinations of water and electric power facilities under the commission's jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fifths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.
PROPOSITION F, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 39

principal, interest, reserve, sinking fund, and other mandatory funds created to secure revenue bonds hereafter issued by the commission for the acquisition, construction or extension of water department or related facilities owned, operated or controlled by the commission; (4) the payment of principal and interest on general obligation bonds hereafter or hereafter issued by the city and county for water department purposes; (5) reconstruction and replacement as determined by the commission or as required by any water department revenue bond ordinance duly adopted and approved; (6) the acquisition of land, real property or interest in real property for, and the acquisition, construction, enlargement and improvement of, new and existing buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, appliances and other property necessary or convenient to the development or improvement of such utility owned, controlled or operated by the commission; and for any other lawful purpose of the commission including the transfer of surplus funds pursuant to section 6.407(e).

7.312 Water Department Revenue Bonds
(a) Subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, the public utilities commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the water department, under such terms and conditions as the commission may authorize by appropriate resolution. Such revenue bonds shall be issued in accordance with the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 as it read, including amendments, on June 5, 1984, except that the provisions of said Revenue Bond Law set forth in sections 54380 through 54388, inclusive, of the government code shall not apply to the issuance and sale of such revenue bonds.
(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the public utilities commission subject to the approval or rejection of the board of supervisors without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute nor evidence any indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from the water department or water department facilities operated or controlled by it.
(c) Water department revenue bonds issued for such purposes pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities under the commission's jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.
(d) The issuance of revenue bonds under this section shall be subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of section 7.300, except that voter approval shall not be required for revenue bond issues for reconstruction and replacement of existing facilities, when authorized by resolution adopted by a three-fourths affirmative vote of all the members of the board of supervisors.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough text.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of the president of the board of supervisors, three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted to the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. The term of office of the six members, other than the president of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager, Chief Investment Officer and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager, a chief investment officer and an actuary, who shall hold office at the board's pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager and the actuary shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by strikethrough text.

Section 3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties.

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

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.
The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the offices of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefor to be fixed in accordance with the salary standards and compensation provisions of this charter. The recorder shall be separate officer of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a confidential secretary who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

PROPOSITION I, CONTINUED FROM PAGE 50

those five members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1987. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1986, shall be for a term of three years. At the general municipal election in 1989, and in every fourth year thereafter, successors to said three members of the board of supervisors shall be elected and hold office for a term of four years.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1981, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date and the eleven persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said 8th day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: The six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Therefore, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected; and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof of whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

proposed ordinance

PROPOSITION K

NOTE: This section is entirely new.

Be it ordained by the people of San Francisco:

No building permit authorizing the construction of any structure that will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission may be issued except upon prior action of the City Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance; provided, however, that the provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to building permits authorizing: structures which do not exceed 40 feet in height; structures which cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission only during the first hour after sunrise and/or the last hour before sunset; structures to be constructed on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission for recreational and park-related purposes; structures of the same height and in the same location as structures in place on June 6, 1984; projects for which a building permit application has been filed and either (i) a public hearing has been held prior to March 5, 1984 on a draft environmental impact report published by the Department of City Planning, or (ii) a Negative Declaration has been published by the Department of City Planning prior to the date of adoption of this initiative ordinance; or projects for which a building permit application and an application for environmental evaluation have been filed prior to March 5, 1984 and which involve physical integration of new construction with rehabilitation of a building designated as historic either by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors as a historical landmark or by the State Historic Preservation Officer as a State Historic Landmark, or placed by the United States Department of the Interior on the National Register of His- toric Places and which are located on sites that, but for separation by a street or alley, are adjacent to such historic building. The City Planning Commission shall conduct a hearing and shall disapprove the issuance of any building permit governed by the provisions of this ordinance if it finds that the proposed project will have any adverse impact on the use of the property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission because of the shading or shadowing that it will cause, unless it is determined that the impact would be insignificant. The City Planning Commission shall not make the determination required by the provisions of this subsection until the general manager of the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment to the City Planning Commission upon the proposed project. The City Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission, after a joint meeting, shall adopt criteria for the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance. The zoning administrator shall determine which applications for building permits propose structures which will cast a shade or shadow upon property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission. As used in this subsection, "property designated for acquisition by the Recreation and Park Commission" shall mean property which a majority of each of the Recreation and Park Commission and the City Planning Commission meeting jointly, with the concurrence of the Board of Supervisors, have recommended for acquisition from the open space acquisition and park renovation fund which property is to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The provisions of this ordinance shall also be incorporated into the City Planning Code.
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**WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:**

The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td>for President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representative in Congress, 5th District**

City and County of SAN FRANCISCO

ELECCIÓN GENERAL 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

GENERAL ELECTION NOVEMBER 6, 1984

1/16
(There is no contest for State Senator in this District)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal.)

本區沒有州參議員選舉。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member of the State Assembly</strong></td>
<td><strong>16th District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS, Republican</td>
<td>71 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Central Committeeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comité Central Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS, Democratic</td>
<td>73 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assemblyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asambleista Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Member, Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant, Militante Sindical</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist, Musician</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect, Neighborhood Planner, Arquitecto</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer, Productor de Programas</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Professor</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el cargo</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency, Escritor</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney, Abogado</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action, Escritor, Movimiento</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney, Abogado de Servicio</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator, Administrador de Servicios</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant, Consultor Político</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman, Mujer de Negocios</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor Administrativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>行政管理顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisasores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>音樂家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado / Miembro, Junta de Supervisasores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vendedor de Bienes y Raices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaria Administrativa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisasores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Especialista en Ciencias Politicas / Educador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor de Economia / Escritor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisasores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banquero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>楼行人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Militante Sindical Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representante de Ventas de Directorics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY ANDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estudiante de SFCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Incumbent/現任教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Incumbent/現任教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Community Services Director/社區服務主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator/貨車司機</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Parent and Teacher/Maestra y Madre de Familia/家長和教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público/Financial Consultant/財政顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Consultant/顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Incumbent/現任教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway/市營公共車監督</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote por no más de 4
Vote for No More than Four
**Member, Community College Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><strong>CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><strong>STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUP BOND ACT.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><strong>SENIOR CENTER BOND ACT OF 1984.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td><strong>PROPERTY TAXATION. FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS EXCLUSION.</strong> Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td><strong>SUPREME COURT. TRANSFER OF CAUSES. REVIEW OF DECISIONS.</strong> Modifies existing constitutional provisions regarding transfer of causes and review of decisions. Fiscal Impact: No significant effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DO LOS VOTANTES PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>VOTO</th>
<th>TEXTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para el control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y los proyectos para actividades de recuperación del agua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoría de las escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar del medio las substancias peligrosas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALUBRE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejora de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $650,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>FUERON DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD, EXCUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS. Obriga poder a la Legislatura para excluir del reaño del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejorías recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser llevada a cabo, impuestos en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de 55 millones anuales, además aumentos en los gastos del gabinete estatal para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida en impuestos a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en los ingresos provenientes del impuesto a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>CORTE SUPREMA. TRANSFERENCIA DE CAUSAS, REVISIÓN DE DECISIONES. Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigencia en cuanto al traspaso de causas y la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON. Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION. Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

(Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot)

TAXATION. Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

STATE LOTTERY. Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY. Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.
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33. POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer el pago del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por su dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales, los cuales serían recuperados con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

34. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ESPECIALIDAD EDUCATIVA. Exime del recaudado el impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que son estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

35. La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

36. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Emenda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar. Dispone reembolsos especificados de impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales por lo menos $100 millones netos, durante el primer periodo de dos años. Aumento en los costos estatales de hasta $750 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsecuentes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.6 mil millones netos, durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años subsecuentes.

37. LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública sería de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: jardín de niños al 12º grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

38. MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador urja a los oficiales federales a que emiendan la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.
REAPPORTIONMENT. Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reappor- tionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS. Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate's personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

B Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

C Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?
REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos para 1986 y para las elecciones subsiguientes mediante una comisión compuesta de anteriores jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos de la comisión de hasta $3.5 millones antes de la elección de 1986. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada uno para reubicar un número desconocido de oficinas legislativas en los distritos. Costos del condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1986. Aportes para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1986 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que baja la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPAÑÍAS. Limita a los contribuyedores y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos políticos electivos, iguala con fondos públicos limitados los gastos personales del candidato de oposición. Impacto fiscal: Reducir los gastos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente hasta $1,850,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite emiendas legislativas, Impacto fiscal: la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y condados comenzando el 1º de julio de 1986. El tamaño de la reducción y su impacto en los diferentes niveles del gobierno es imposible determinarse en este momento. Reducciones substanciales bajo Programas especificados serían parcialmente compensadas hasta un grado desconocido mediante el aumento de otros gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Puerto a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

B. ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Aguas?

C. ¿Deberá crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista de seis miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la ciudad y el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
<td>應否授權退休委員會作退休基金投資時，可用個人判斷謹慎行事，而不必限於作法律容許保險公司所作的投資?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
<td>市政府給在職身故或退休後去世的僱員的遺僕的保健福利金，應否與在職或退休僱員的津貼相同?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagarse un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y periodo de empleo?</td>
<td>在工作中或在工作範圍內身體遭受暴力引致的外傷而殉職的各類官員和僱員，應否付給十二個月薪酬的死亡撫恤金?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>¿Deberá el período probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?</td>
<td>應否延長警員的試用期，即從加入警局起一年延至完成訓練後一年的時間，但不能超過八十四星期?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagarse un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
<td>應否給予警局駕駛兩輪摩托車的警員額外報酬，其數額根據加州有350,000人口的城市此種報酬的平均數而定?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pregunte a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un excesivo gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
<td>(創制法令)：舊金山應否要求聯邦政府詢求所有納稅人的意見是否願意讓他們的稅款用在過度的軍事費用上，並由市政府每年刊印一份報告，詳列有關聯邦在舊金山所徵稅款，以及用於過度軍事目的和用於社會需要的部分?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningún fondo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?</td>
<td>(政策聲明)：舊金山應否制訂政策，規定市政府管理的退休基金不能投資在與南非有商業關係的商號，直至南非廢除種族隔離，給予黑人充分的政治權利和民權為止?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

A 第一步
请向助理员取新选票。

B 第一步
请将选票向自动机将整个选票插入。

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."

C 第二步
请将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红点之上。

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 artículos que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabezuelas rojas.

D 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红點之上。

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.

E 第三步
请把带锋之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

F 第四步
投票选票之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格预备作投票人应用。
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your address when you signed up to vote,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**BALLOT**—A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT**—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

**VOTE BY MAIL**—See Absentee Ballot, above.

**POLL**—The place where you go to vote.

**PROPOSITION**—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

**CHALLENGE**—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE**—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

**PETITION**—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**BONDS**—Contracts to borrow and repay money.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER**

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"It appears to be one end of the November 7 San Francisco ballot..."

Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.

(Because there are no BART candidates in your district this page would otherwise have been blank.)
Candidates for Supervisor

JOHN SALEH ABDULLA

My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city’s acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Comoner, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabrao, 3609-18th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 487 Jost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O’Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhya S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative, Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O’Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO

My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco’s Charter permits supervisorial inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programer/analyst
Rose Violet Desillo, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdra D. Dunlap, 125 DeMontfort Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Fauster, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garin, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 58 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Koebler, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryenne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1709 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Topeka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemer, 125 Combon Dr., Retired-Produce Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampiera, 328 Stipes Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thomson, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

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

ROGER BOSCHETTI

My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women. I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 1958 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 631 O’Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 250 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1458-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Michelli, 2655 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilsen, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1324 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allston St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judith St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zygaj, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spikes Reagan’s anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 256B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2560-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikogami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennyse Stanford, 53 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

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

HARRY BRITT

My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I've worked to see that every San Francisco resident enjoys quality of life in our neighborhoods and environment.
• I've supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinari, 50-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Donis Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Eveson St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent/University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner, Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant's Rights Worker
Edward L. Feet, 350 Arballo Dr., Senior Citizen's Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1208 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus
Leon Burschert, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Floyd, 355 Noriega St., Minister
Andrea Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Verano St., West Portal Avenue Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER

My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portand-Free buses downtown.
We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni’s cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.
Please call 864-8864 if you’d like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.
If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig B. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Dornacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tanci, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymund E. Pena, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 851 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parrinello, 312 Precaite Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burnside, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 396 Precaite St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julliane Malvaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist

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

JONATHAN BULKLEY

My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54

My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor's Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture / Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
- Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
- Crime-free streets
- Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
- Caring solutions to seniors' needs.
- Eliminating Bay pollution.
- Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan Bulkley

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:

Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 2301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ira Dearman, 217 Upper Tat., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandez, 46-453rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 290 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louis J. Giraud, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzalez, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravanis, 74 Mizeh St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1306 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass'n.
Don Hornsby, 84 Keltich Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kuhns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Jim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Reality House West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 2627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O'Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Petetti, 3767-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary's Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor's gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Aranu Cl., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikeyami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennyse Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student
Candidates for Supervisor

ELEANOR M. DAVIS

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor's Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d'Ottille, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d'Ottille, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 542-56th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gillian, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rue Grubstick, 247-40th Ave., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 44 Mallorca Way, Bank Clerk
Bernice Langley, 420 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D MacGilley, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J. McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1537 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1537 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phipps, 230 Prospect Av., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catharine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whiteland, 3130 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:

Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Bacci, 2478-23rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachael Baltoe, 2323 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1238 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Cassano, 863 Carolina St., Artist
Tom Delacorte, 2025 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J Dodd, 61 Deming St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 109-12th Ave, Attorney at Law
Arielle DuVall, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Fine Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 582 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Keating, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirtley, 1344 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kushner, 35 Presidio Ter., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 17 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Garry Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rowell, 1319-5th Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Straus, 1734-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debbie Weinberg, 3513 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

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

ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM

My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33

**My qualifications for office are:** Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.

I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.

Pathetic Wendy Nelder says “Fluoride causes AIDS”; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with “Oh What a Night” baccalalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.

San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche’s NDPC in our fight.

*Robert Daniel Ingraham*

**The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:**
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortilift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elona Hardy, 143 Fairlomes St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Leone, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Rosalt St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Porillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shaiman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Connar Souls, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Stainace, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

RUBY T. JIMENEZ

My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45

**My qualifications for office are:** A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican descent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Iberia-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

*Ruby T. Jimenez*

**The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:**
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Heiton, 93 Prentiss St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ona Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lanzano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Ruth Matias, 638 Sawyer St., Office Clerk
Patricia McDonagh, 385-28th St., Housewife
Thomas McDonagh, 385-28th St., Construction
Ruth E. Rosenberg, 165 Parusius Ave., Instructor
Leticia Wickensharm, 171 Precita Ave.
Lupe D. Zamudio, 274 Broad St., Sales Representative

---

*Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.*
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ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I'm involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel partents resource center. I've been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as "Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Major Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I'd like to dedicate my Supivrrial campaigne to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones are:

Stephen Harold Irvine, 2037 15th St., Carpenter
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Joseph A. DeCarlo, 1300 Hampshire St., Chairperson of MHD
David L. Butler, 895 Shotwell St., Salesman
Diane Moananu, 45 Watchman Way, Graduate Student
David Levinson, MD, 2927 Folsom St., Physician
Helen Butler, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Cachier
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect
Rose Sillard, 10 Lucky St., Housewife
John Maras, 20-12th St., Student
Donald Strieckland, 981 Shotwell St., Musician & Carpenter
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Hiring Hall Director
Oscar Herrera, 360 Holyoke St., Educator
Delmar T. BERGE, 142 Central Ave., Professional Musician
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Jesus S. Valencia, 751 Castro St., Job Developer
Peter Anthony Rivera, 57 Peters Ave., Counselor
Fernando Cosio, 177 Johnstone Dr., Executive Director
Miguel Quinnoz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Social Worker
Harry W. Madison, 4017 Folsom St., Appliance Repair
Paul Sussman, 1243 Third Ave., Housing Finance
Carmencita L. De la Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Kathryn M. McCamant, 625 Scott St., Tenant Organizer
Lynne Beeson, 2135-28th Ave., Grants Coordinator
Harry E. Baker, 1345 Clement St., Project Coordinator

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/ Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guererro St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agrinero R. Cebatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hormel, 19 Migue St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Tampa Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lera, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 566-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician

My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I “Keyes” will open doors for you, to; homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your “Keyes”. Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while “special interest” lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:

Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator,
Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmel, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moebes, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 666 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40

My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new “Apollo” program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:

Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Gracielo Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 307 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative

Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozialis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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QUENTIN L. KOPP
My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I’ve fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I’m proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your “financial watchdog” in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Aloisi, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sara Burton, 8 Staat Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 22 Bosco Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2060 O’Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 2990 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schivo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Marzian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAtee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed
Businesswoman
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Vukich, 177 San Aleso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS
My address is 577 Arbello Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29

My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center
As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks
You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Alonzo, 577 Arbello Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobrowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 176 Thurston Heights Blvd., Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangiel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Monticello, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kelloch St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richard Loewinsohn, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Loret, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Berniece Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan Mc Curdy, 80 Alvaro St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Scheckman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William T. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker
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JULIANNE MALVEAUX
My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan and former White House staffer (1977–78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisors
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:
Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Judith Brecka, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1330 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Cazenave, 2821-28th St., Housing Advocacy
Trence Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gannon, 3649-19th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shafter St., Architect
Roberto Y. Hernandez, 852 Moutrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doris W. Kahn, 5259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblenz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orelia Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Lathan, 2350-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Diale Reese, 2034-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnapp, 720-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shaakian, 229-22nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Osgeo St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 Fernando Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. St.Cyr, 543 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME Local 2501
Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI
My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.
For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Delores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 11 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maidux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 340 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yuri Wada, 563 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Holteclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Fillbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant
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PAT NORMAN

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.  

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 188 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 565 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane McKeeble Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coitridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tish A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stullings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:
Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 436-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 357-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G. Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laun Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Brochetti, 20 Cornelian St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bilan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 425-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Barst, 1220 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1257-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyers, Jr, 5252 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shrader St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I. Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Keksteins, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.
At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).
My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.
As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli St., President, Urban Development
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO
Sara Burton, 8 Sloan Blvd., Member of Congress
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shafter St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. AMOS S. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloa Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Callil, 240-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3189 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Richard Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Marty J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, IFGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrance, 2452 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 78-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Alvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer, Redevelopment Agency
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Fillbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.
—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

Carol Ruth Silver

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloa Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnost, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hungate, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Mahur, 69 Elsie St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Ting, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Fywan, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave
Yuri Wada, 35-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Doyno, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Terressa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 406-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education
Ephraim Maggini, 60 Secane Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clar Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ave., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trouhilo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

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

My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd  
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency  
My age is 34  
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city's growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:

James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister  
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife  
Janis Ann Berti, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary  
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer  
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer  
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst  
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover  
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer  
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife  
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tupia Dr., Homemaker  
David Hepburn, 20 Tupia Dr., High School President  
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer  
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife  
James L. Higgins, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor  
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary  
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College  
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany blvd., Retired  
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary  
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student  
John A. McGeehan, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army  
Charles A. McIlhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy  
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager  
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary  
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker  
Lawrence W. Pong, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector  
James Douglas Robinson,'1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager  
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization  
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurateur  
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

KEVIN STARR

My address is 445 Chestnut Street  
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor  
My age is 44  
My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:

Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant  
Lynn A. Altshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney  
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moncada Way, Clergyman  
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director  
Gino Biradelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur  
Samp Camhi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner  
Frank J. Caulfield, 1034 Alemany St., Venture Capital Investor  
Vyot L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner  
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2802 Scott St., Legal Assistant  
Paul Derniag, 2165 California St., Investment Banker  
Martin Eng, 665 Pine St., County Central Committee Member  
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney  
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney  
Walter E. Headley, 999 Green St., Economist  
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney  
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant  
Dorwin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels  
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator  
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal  
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor  
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive  
Roxanne Mankin, 2312 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate  
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Retail Estate and Development Consultant  
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38  
John N. Rosekrans, Jr, 2840 Broadway , Businessman, Toy Manufacturer  
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman  
Michael Strumsky, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive  
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive  
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JOHN E. WAHL
My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.

I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.

I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 426 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Carolee W. Marks, 35 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 54 Wintfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 420-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126 22nd St., Clergyperson
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 5863-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-48th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Evel K. Kuchtender, 115 San Alejo, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myrescough, 156 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hartman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jenny G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Pamela A. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 806-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary
Jeanette Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner

Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julia V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN
My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58

My qualifications for office are: My program:

Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers' residences.

Door-key children of working parents, denied childcare, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.

Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A. Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 558-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Elmer, 613 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzales, 2543 32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoremot
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Leamer, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Meusel, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda I. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessie St., Machinist
Karen A. Schieve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Setian, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean Vandervelde, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1836 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

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

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44

It’s time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It’s time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Denebem, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicin Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishhacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell I. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 923 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armao, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 353-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAllister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DICK CERBATOS
My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focussing on education. As an engineer businessman, I also bring professional skills to the Board.

As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.

I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.

I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatos

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Brit, 785 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diane Christensen, 56 Sandoz St., Executive Director
Judy Delflaminique, 3323 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsed, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas, E. Horn, 950 Rockduller Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattia J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Laton-Vice President, ILGWU

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON
My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.

For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Peiton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Peiton.

I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.

I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:

Essie L. Webb, 186 Medblade Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1700-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Della Rosa, 30 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Liana Sand Dune Quintana, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lobon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne E. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 176 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 5331 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 340 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, R. Willkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
LIBBY DENEBEIM
My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.
I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.
There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.
Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:
Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sats Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2386 Green St., Community Leader
Carlota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Education, Supervisor
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Rafal, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Leaders
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pansy Ponzi Walker, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Seaciff Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA
My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.
I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.
Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:
Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Auray, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaola, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Isom, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escalada Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Mim Landry, 1040 Yale St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mission St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mess, M.D./S. Bunde's Lund Center, AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1332-36th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Parnas Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Montecito St., Attorney
Michael Stepman, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lombard Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Fillinas, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 1526-26th Ave., Editor

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

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant
My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
• Our children's inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.
Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.

Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny T. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Denslow Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Belli, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Silazaur, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pansewong, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palmi Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McLennan, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
E. Theodore Kitt, 2901 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P.-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Peterslie, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-35th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Sarmoyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alioto, 2898 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 444 Coret Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Asso.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician
My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:
Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Supervisor
Rosalio Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agripino R. Carbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodoma M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Neider, 150 Castas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palmos Dr., Labor Officier
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-435th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfis, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbaum, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anton H. Sanchez, 44 Restanu Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Grey, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Capser, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raye G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heath Ave., Clergymen
Larry Mazzola, 3400-24th Ave, Asst Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lanie E. De Larr, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Linsner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor
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TERRY HUGUNIN
My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy's Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: "We're going to the moon in ten years!" Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60's have given way to the "other-directedness" of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

JAMES LEGARE
My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:
1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Gracielia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Fairlawn St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingram, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilker, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilker, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-10th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Leczano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Raslin St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soutts, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozzatis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

The sponsors for James Legare are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Gracielia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Fairlawn St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingram, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilker, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Leczano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Raslin St., Foster Mother
Nick Pacc, 130 Campbell Ave., Railroad Employee
Sandra Parks, 16 Garces St., Railroad Employee
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soutts, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejos, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozzatis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

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

JO ANNE MILLER

My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher

My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst

My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:

Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fries, 830-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 675 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearn, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Darro Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kofp, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kortum, 90 Madero Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asian Laniyu, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Ellis St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 358 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmoor Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shinnick, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAIFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castas Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jesse T. Esteva, 525 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hom, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Ellis St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrack St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kropf, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arlie Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembleynum, 16th District

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

ERNEST "CHUCK" AYALA

My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administering Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest "Chuck" Ayala are:

Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Cook, 59 Chabot St., House Wife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Farooh, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Riley St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapilica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Legger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lubetich, 15 Florentine St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman-Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Roudales, 340-A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thomatra N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Barb A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Policeman Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave, U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3500 Kirkham St., Attorney at law
Bill Zorzakis, 545 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN

My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on board of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1983 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Dennard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Duane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard H. Hangisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grundevil A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 69 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Predita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Laurerett Newkirk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Maimon M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiltiris St., Minister
Hunnibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wofred, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alain A. Wong, 1200 Ellis St., Social Worker

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

PATRICK C. FITZGERALD

My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committeeman, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are:
• Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
• Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
• Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeman (since 1970)
• California State Central Committeeman (since 1978)
• Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferrero
• Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
• Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
• Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O’Dowd
• Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committeee
• Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
• Successfully fought peripheral canal
• Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

Patrick C. Fitzgerald

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Labor Leader
Teresa Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Mooser, 1702-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman

DEAN GOODMAN

My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64

My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator’s concern for quality instruction, and a citizen’s awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

Dean Goodman

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I. Balman, 5 Pereg Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kimo Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climent, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergren Kahl, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marne St., Attorney
Donnait J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1667 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nomura, 177 Bocana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3141 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stodard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Trantham, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Sigrid Wurschmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman

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

ANDRE F. PEHARGOU
My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:

JULIE TANG
My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor’s degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master’s in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women’s issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assemblyman Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors Yuki Wada, 365-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco Constance O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff’s Dept. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister Timothy R. Wiltreed, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board Robert F. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner Agrapino R. Cebotaro, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator Carol Kuitz Silver, 68 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor Bette W. Landis, 44 entrada Ct., Volunteer Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney’s Investigator Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

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

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the faculty and administration whose main responsibility is superior teaching for professional and occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing and challenging; therefore community colleges must work for quality education for all.

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:

Lilian Aldea, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Bust0, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Bust0, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Bust0, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Enriqueta P. Cespedes, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odelia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felicia P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Wilkie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Ponewash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Encarnaclon A. Ramos, 2700 Polson St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board

My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:

Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Browm, 1201 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Brit, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sedonia Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Denebein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Agrapino R. Cerbato, 471 Hoffman Ave, School Board Member
Carlotta T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Morf, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 3757-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Rosselli, 346 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 562-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

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

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

- Bond redemption $42,500,000
- Bond interest $81,761,400
- Total debt service requirement $124,261,400

“Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco's income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That's the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City's fishing fleet at Fisherman's Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City's future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves.

We **must** restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

**VOTE YES ON PROP A!**

*Wendy Nelder*
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A **YES vote on Proposition A** will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements **AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS**.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition **A** will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting **YES**.

*Salu Burton,*
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting **YES on Proposition A**.

*Milton Marks,*
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But . . . times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements **RIGHT NOW.** And . . . **AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!**

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.**

**VOTE YES ON PROP A!**

*SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION*

Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halstead, Member
James Herman, Member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PRESIDENTIAL GENERAL ELECTION—NOVEMBER 6, 1984
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________________________
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(over)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES 25  NO 184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES 26  NO 187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES 27  NO 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES 28  NO 193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>YES 29  NO 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES 30  NO 199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>YES 31  NO 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>YES 32  NO 206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>YES 33  NO 210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>YES 34  NO 214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>YES 35  NO 223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>YES A 253  NO 254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>YES B 256  NO 257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>YES C 259  NO 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>YES D 261  NO 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>YES E 264  NO 265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>YES F 267  NO 268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>YES G 270  NO 271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>YES H 274  NO 275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>YES I 278  NO 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>YES J 283  NO 284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Board (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:
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PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:

DESCRIPTION OF HANDICAP/DISABILITY
Voter's Initials ________

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Volante Ausente Permanente.

DESCRIPCIÓN DEL IMPEDEIMIENTO/INCAPACIDAD
Iniciales del Volante ________

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

FOREIGN LANGUAGE
FROM:

DID YOU SIGN APPLICATION?  
(¿FIRMO SU APLICACION?)

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN 
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1984  
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ELECCION.

JAY PATTERSON  
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS  
155 CITY HALL  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fisherman’s Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman’s Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner’s Association

Christopher Martin
President, Fisherman’s Wharf Merchant Assoc.
Fritz Arko
Alessandro Baccari
Ex. Secretary, Fisherman’s Wharf Merchant Assoc.
L. B. Barnes
Fisherman’s Wharf Seafood
Phil Bentivegna
Fishing Boat Butchie B
Bob Bugatto
California Shell Fish Co.
Ken Burger
Franciscan Restaurant
Pat Flanagan
Standard Fisheries
Anthony Casali
Fishing Boat Norene
Virgil P. Caselli, Native
S. Joseph Cincotta
F. Alioto Fish Co.
Nick D’Amato
Fishing Boat Nicky D
Nino Geraldi
Tom Lazio
Tom Lazio Fish Co.
Andrew Lolli
William McDonnell
Albert Spadaro
Sports Fishing Boat
New Flories
Mario J. Alioto
Calif. Seafood Institute
Peter Brown
The Anchorage

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!

Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don’t let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Sec/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twomey, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women’s Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks
and Recreation in Chinatown*

Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities. But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray  Mabel Schine
Doris Thomas  Linda Dickens
J. E. Thomas  Faye Anderson
A. Brooks  Zuretti Goosby
Frankie Gillette  Stan Palomares-Criollos
Lois DeCayette  Jene Rita Alviar
Joel DeCayette  Ernest C. Ayala
Jule Anderson  Alan S. Wong
Althedra Carrie  Stan Moy
George Newkirk  Douglas S. Chan
Elouise Westbrook  Thomas Hsieh
Shirley Jones  Alicia Wang
Clifton Jeffers  Ben Tom
Joe Williams  Pius Lee
Carol Belle  Julie Tang
Benjamin James  Louis Hop Lee
Grandvel Jackson  Dennis Wong
Amos Brown  Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco’s maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco’s competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America’s Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a "fast track", it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by "letter agreements" with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no-long term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn't even secured written "letter agreements" from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman's Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It's like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don't have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING
PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other marine time-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco's piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?
PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

YES 256 ▼
NO 257 ▼

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

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

Bond redemption $104,000,000
Bond interest 169,260,000
Total debt service requirement $273,260,000

“Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There is now no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
Health Commission

PROPOSITION C

Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

YES 259

NO 260

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City’s Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer's auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor's control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a "yes" vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can't something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General's "major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc."

Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of "a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance" as a cause for "ineffective management.

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos  Supervisor Bill Maher  Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Willie Kennedy  Supervisor Harry Britt  Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Louise Renne  Supervisor Doris Ward

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

San Francisco’s population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department’s role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors’ needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Depart-
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, non-profit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

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

Sydney Furman
Carlos Castrillo
Leroy Jaguez*,
Estella Lara
Ricardo Hernandez

Igor Kalinovsky, M.D.
Bayra Matias
Andres Sendin
Consuelo Payes
Guadalupe Cuellar

Esperanza Martinez
Manuel Larez
Esperanze Echavarri
Stan Palomares-Criollos
Jene Alvin

Antonia Sacchetti
Maria Chavez
Maria Scicneux
Alicia Hopkinson
Celia Fernandez

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO's opposition is understandable. He simply doesn't want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC's opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10-15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let's clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

Pattie Fong
Ina Dearman
Patrick Flanagan
Douglas Engmann

Ellen Robert
Christopher Martin
Tom Moore
Henry Der

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Fred Ross
James O'Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Yoachum
D.J. Soviero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
JoAnne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O'Driscoll
Nicerita Revelo

Beatrice Patterson
Thomas Ambrogi
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Peter Hanson
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken McEldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holtzclaw

Paul Vacaralli
Al Cassiaio
Alan Raznick
James Haas
Al Borvice
Eddie Webb
Joan Moulton
Russell Zellers
Stanley Shields
Richard Sevilla
Ann Daley
Dorothy Labudde
Dorice Murphy
Howard Strasser
Mark Davalos
Larry Griffin

Jay Wallace
Rob Waters
Kevin Malone
Jan Holloway
Norman Rolfe
Tom Jones
Barbara Halliday
Sandra Powell
Deborah Survis
Esther Marks
James Augustino
Sharon Johnson
Eileen Adams
Ruth Gravanis
Michael Heffer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium

Myles Dixon
George Dykstra
Susan Ehrlich
Patricia Franks
Debra Friedland
Kate Lambert

Mike Pincus
David Smith, M.D.
Marjin Waukazo
Jerome West
Sophie Wong

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

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics. But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department's policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be ad-

dressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a "commission" to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City's health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was "to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION." (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be "protected from political influence as largely as possible..." and "it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence." Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a "seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure." To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that "the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management." Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board’s reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. “The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administrative structure.”

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the county. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a “crisis-to-crisis” basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco’s health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city’s health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote “No” on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yuri Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city’s highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital’s AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city’s health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a “strong mayor” type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.
2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services.

Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department's health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer's budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer's Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco's health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; 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.

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 (Continued on page 82)
Retirement Board Investments

PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?

YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments. Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serve a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System's investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It's logical. That's why I recommend a "yes" vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name  ____________________________________________  
Address ______________________________________ Apt. # ____
Telephone No. (required) ___________________________________
Do you have an automobile?   yes □   no □
Availability:  
I want to work in the following area(s): ______________________
Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________
Signature ____________________________________________
Surviving Spouse Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?

YES 264
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a health care fund for active and retired employees. The City’s contribution to this fund equals the average amount contributed to health care funds for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for a least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County’s share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse's pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your "YES" vote on Proposition "E" on the basis of need and equity.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let's extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $900,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs  
Executive Director  
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT  
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of members and retired persons of the parking authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the health service system fund since the date of adoption of this amendment and the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the health service system fund since the date of adoption of this amendment and the provisions of section 8.423, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members. The contributions to the health service system fund shall be charged against the general fund or the special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972 and November 6, 1984 shall be effective July 1, 1973 and 1985.

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267
NO 268

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 69.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let's agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetchy Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member's contributions to the system, plus six months' salary.

Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months' salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

8.509 Retirement—Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

A(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

(Continued on page 84)
Police Probationary Period

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
Police Probationary Period

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services. The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Police Chief asked for a longer probationary period because it is needed. Vote yes.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G. In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrol cars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This is probably the most important proposition on this Fall's ballot, a common sense measure. It deals with the Police Department, which has the ultimate responsibility for the protection of persons and property in our community. It increases the probationary period of police officers by one year. It is intended to ensure that the men and women who protect us are of the highest quality possible. Right now, police officers actually have only a four month probationary period. That's because they spend over 12 months probation in class and training, and only four months on the streets and on the job.

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

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

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given to the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatches.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casciato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City’s parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally-perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of "excessive military expenditures", as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City's Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens' Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don't think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don't want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How "I" Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial."

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
Military & Social Spending Initiative

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers’ money for a handful of misguided individuals? City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION I

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:
(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as “star-war” weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).
(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.
(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.
(d) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) average individual tax contribution;
(f) average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen’s Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen’s Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned Peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.
PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283
NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mornen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke
South African Investment Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa. They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa. It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries’ pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa — political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure." (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said "foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism." As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J"

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid "a crime against humanity"; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN - ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights

Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Caris Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee

Todd Roust
Republican State Senate Nominee

Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied

the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow

Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman

The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535

Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250

Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for
Congress, Fifth Congressional District

Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples' Congress

Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral "Crime against humanity" of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on. . . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION B

RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES, AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.301, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

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

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

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboards, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

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, 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 or 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 islevied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating thereto, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
traffic safety education;
(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;
(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;
(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and
(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

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 upon 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.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than ten years' practice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician or surgeon requirement may be waived by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services; who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Kaiser Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of the San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certificated. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. The board shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years; provided, however, that those first-appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1933, 1934 and 1935, respectively, and the term of one member in 1936.

Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

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 June 3, 1980 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.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less that a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workmen's compensation laws of the State of California shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the re-
tirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "misanter officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

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

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

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural and the plural singular.

"Interest" shall mean interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

B (b) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection G (g) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection G (g) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within thirty 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five 65 years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

E (e) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in subsection G (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection A (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowance shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

D (d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

E (e) If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall cease to such child or children collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(a) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(b) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this subsection E (e), for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this subsection E (e), any allowance payable under this subdivision (2) shall be reduced the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member’s death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

F (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system;
provided that if such member is entitled to
be credited with at least ten years of service
or if his accumulated contributions exceed
one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall
have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after said
termination of service, or if the termination
was by lay-off, ninety 90 days after the
retirement board determines the termina-
tion to be permanent, whether to allow his
accumulated contributions to remain in the
retirement fund and to receive benefits only
as provided in this paragraph. Failure
to make such election shall be deemed an
irrevocable election to withdraw his accu-
mulated contributions. A person who
elects to allow his accumulated contribu-
tions to remain in the retirement fund shall
be subject to the same age requirements as
apply to other members under this section
for service retirement but he shall not be
subject to a minimum service require-
ment. Upon the qualification of such mem-
ber for retirement by reason of age, he
shall be entitled to receive a retirement al-
lowance which shall be the actuarial equiva-
lent of his accumulated contributions and
an equal amount of the contributions of the
city and county, plus one and two-thirds
(1 2/3) percent of his average final compensa-
tion for each year of service credited to
him as rendered prior to his first member-
ship in the retirement system. Upon the
death of such member prior to retirement,
his contributions with interest credited
thereon shall be paid to his estate or des-
ignated beneficiary.

G (g) The following time and service
shall be included in the computation of the
service to be credited to a member for the
purpose of determining whether such
member qualifies for retirement and cal-
culating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is
a member of the retirement system and
during and for which said member is enti-
tled to receive compensation because of
services as a miscellaneous officer or em-
ployee.

(2) Service in the fire and police de-
partments which is not credited as service
of a member under this section shall count
under this section upon transfer of a mem-
ber of either of such departments to em-
ployment entitling him to membership in
the retirement system under this section,
provided that the accumulated contribu-
tion standing to the credit of such member
shall be adjusted by refund to the member
or by payment of the member to bring
the account at the time of such transfer to
the amount which would have been credited to
it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his ser-
vice in either of such departments at the
compensation he received in such depart-
ments.

(3) Time during which said member is
absent from a status included in paragraphs
(1) or (2) next preceding which is not
deemed absence from service under the
provisions of section 8.520 of the charter
and for which such member is entitled to
receive credit as service for the city and
county by virtue of contributions made in
accordance with the provisions of such sec-
tion.

(4) Prior service determined and cred-
ited as prescribed by the board of super-
visors for persons who are members under
section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by or-
dinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of
its members, may provide for the crediting
as service under the retirement system of
service, other than military service, ren-
dered as an employee of the federal gov-
ernment and services rendered as an em-
ployee of the State of California or any
public entity or public agency in the State
of California. Said ordinance shall provide
that all contributions required as the result
of the crediting of such service shall be
made by the member and that no contri-
butions therefore shall be required of the
city and county.

H (h) All payments provided under
this section shall be made from funds de-
rived from the following sources, plus in-
terest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each
payment of compensation made to a mem-
ber under section 8.509 a sum equal to
seven and one-half (7 1/2) percent of such
payment of compensation. The sum so
deducted shall be paid forthwith to the re-
tirement system. Said contribution shall be
credited to the individual account of the
member from whose salary it was ded-
cuted, and the total of said contributions,
together with interest credited thereon in
the same manner as is prescribed by the
board of supervisors for crediting interest
to contributions of other members of the
retirement system, shall be applied to pro-
vide part of the retirement allowance
granted to, or allowance granted on ac-
count of said member under section 8.509,
or shall be paid to said member or his es-
tate or beneficiary as provided in sections
8.509(c) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time in-
cluded in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsec-
tion G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who
become members under this section, and
standing with interest thereon, to the credit
of said members on the records of the re-
tirement system on said date, shall con-
tinue to be credited to the individual ac-
counts of said members and sha
combined with and administered in
same manner as the contributions
ducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with
interest thereon, made by or charged
against the city and county and standing
a credit, on July 1, 1948, in the account
the retirement system, on account of
sons who become members under this
section, shall be applied to provide the
benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall cont
ute to the retirement system such amo
as may be necessary, when added to con
tributions referred to in the preceding
paragraphs of this subsection H (h), to pi
vide the benefits payable under this s
ction. Such contributions of the city and
county to provide the portion of the ben
fits hereunder which shall be based
service rendered by each member prior to
the date upon which his rate of contri
bution is determined in paragraph (1), s
section H (h), shall not be less during a
fiscal year than the amount of such bene
fit paid during said year. Such contributio
of the city and county to provide the p
tion of the benefits thereunder which sh
be based on service rendered by respecti
members on and after the date stated
the next preceding sentence, shall be mat
in annual installment and the installme
be paid in any year shall be determined
by the application of a percentage to the
total salaries paid during said year, to pe
sons who are members under this sectio
said percentage to be the ratio of the va
e of the effective date hereof, or at the la
date of a periodic actuarial valuation an
vestigation into the experience under th
system, of the benefits thereafter to b
paid under this section, from contribution
of the city and county, less the amount of
such contributions, and plus accumulate
interest thereon, then held by said syste
provide said benefits on account of ser
vice rendered by respective member afte
the date stated in the sentence next pre
ceding, to the value at said respective da
of salaries thereafter payable to said mem
bers. Said values shall be determined by
the actuary, who shall take into account
the interest which shall be earned on said
contributions, the compensation experience
of members, and the probabilities of separa
tion by all causes, of members from serv
before retirement and of death after reti
rement. Said percentage shall be changed
only on the basis of said periodic actua
valuation and investigation into the experi
ence under the system. Said actuarial
valuation shall be made every even
numbered year and said investigation into
the experience under the system shall be
made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision 5 (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debts against the city and county.

(1) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection B (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said subsection B (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) No person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as a election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), e (c), F (f) and (1) (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

(n) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(a) If no benefit is payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarry, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(1) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(2) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this section, any allowance payable under this Subsection (b) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in Subsection (a) of Section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of 18 eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person's child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

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

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for one-year twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from the time of the termination of his the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotional classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the Board of Supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patroilmen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations thereof shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in Section (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in Section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patroilmen patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in Section (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighter classifications in cities in said certification.

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation earnable” as used in section 8.549.

The term “firemen” “firefighters” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the rank of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, patrol officers or firemen firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975–76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

**IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING**

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can’t vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don’t leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don’t have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don’t vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don’t vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don’t live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**STEP 1**

> 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 las dos manos, mete 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 votar y perfora con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

**STEP 4**

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

---

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

* IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER. *如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。*
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) ____________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

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

Second choice locations (if any) ________________________________

Signature ____________________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

Please print clearly or your request will not be honored.
El pedido no sera considerado si no se escribe claramente.

EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
GENERAL ELECTION

5th Congressional District
16th Assembly District
(No State Senate)
(No BART)

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The “yes” or “no” on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.

This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.
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CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR
John Saleh Abdulla ................. 22
Suzanne A. Alberto ................. 22
Roger Boschetti .................... 23
Richard Bradley .................... 23
Harry G. Britt ...................... 24
Randall D. Bronner ................. 24
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Christopher Christenson .......... 37
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George Dykstra .................... 38
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Dr. Timothy Wolfred ............... 45
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PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A
Would authorize issuance of $42.5 million in Fort revenue bonds.
Analysis ......................... 46
Arguments ....................... 47–51
Legal Text ....................... 51

PROPOSITION B
Would authorize issuance of $104 million in Water Department revenue bonds.
Analysis ......................... 52
Arguments ....................... 53
Legal Text ....................... 81, 82

PROPOSITION C
Would remove Health Department from CAO jurisdiction and place it under a commission appointed by the Mayor.
Analysis ......................... 54
Arguments ....................... 55–61
Legal Text ....................... 82–84

PROPOSITION D
Would change the standards under which the Retirement System makes investments.
Analysis ......................... 62
Argument ....................... 63
Legal Text ....................... 63

PROPOSITION E
Would extend employee health benefits to surviving spouses.
Analysis ......................... 65
Arguments ....................... 66, 67
Legal Text ....................... 67

PROPOSITION F
Would give additional death benefit to employees killed on the job.
Analysis ......................... 68
Arguments ....................... 69
Legal Text ....................... 69, 85–89

PROPOSITION G
Would increase the probationary period for new police officers.
Analysis ......................... 70
Arguments ....................... 71
Legal Text ....................... 89

PROPOSITION H
Would grant motorcycle premium pay to all two-wheel motorcycle police officers.
Analysis ......................... 72
Arguments ....................... 73
Legal Text ....................... 89–92

PROPOSITION I
Would require CAO to monitor military and social expenditures by Federal government and produce annual report.
Analysis ......................... 74
Arguments ....................... 75
Legal Text ....................... 75

PROPOSITION J
Would declare an official policy of not investing City pension funds in companies doing business in South Africa.
Analysis ......................... 76
Argument ....................... 77–80

CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the Committee are Dick Robertson (Chair), Suzanne Guyette, Roberta Borganova, Stephanie Salter and Susan Kwock. They were assisted by Thomas Toomey of the City Attorney’s Office.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfure la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando hayan dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfure la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfure la balota en el circulo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "Sí" o después de la palabra "No".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfura, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobres, devuelvalo al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

投票你所選擇的任何候選人，請在選票上對應於候選人姓名的打孔上打孔。如果有兩位或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上對應於所有候選人中，選擇你要投選的候選人打孔，但不
要超過要選舉的候選人數。

選舉合資的非候選人候選人，請在非候選候選人選票信封所提供的預定位置上寫下該候選人
所競選的職位和必勝的姓名。

投票任何候選人，請在選票上對應於候選人姓名 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有損色、擦破、塗污、選票無作用。

如果你在選票上打孔後，撕破或弄壞了；或撕破了、弄壞了非候選候選人的選票信封，應
把該選票還給給選舉區的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
# President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td>for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# United States Representative 5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **TOM SPINOSA**, Republican
- **HENRY CLARK**, Peace & Freedom
- **JOSEPH FUHRIG**, Libertarian
- **SALA BURTON**, Democratic
| SENADOR ESTATAL  州参議員 | 請選一名  
| State Senator  
3rd District | Vote por Uno  
Vote for One |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| MILTON MARKS, Republican  
State Senator  
Senador Estatal  州参議員 | 58 → |
| PAUL KANGAS, Peace & Freedom  
Socialist Organizer  
Organizador Socialista  社会主義組織者 | 60 → |
| LIA BELLI, Democratic  
Trade Negotiator/Conservationist  貿易談判員／環境保護者  
Negociador de Comercio/Aboga Por La Conservación | 62 → |
| MARK PICKENS, Libertarian  
Small Business Owner  
Propietario de Pequenos Negocios  小業者 | 64 → |

| MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA Estatal  州衆議員 | 請選一名  
| Member of the State Assembly  
16th District | Vote por Uno  
Vote for One |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| MAX WOODS, Republican  
State Central Committeeman  
Comité Central Estatal  州中央委員 | 71 → |
| ART AGNOS, Democratic  
State Assembleyman  
Asambleista Estatal  州衆議員 | 73 → |
### Member, Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialism Union Militant</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist, Musician</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect, Neighborhood Planner</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer, Producer Program</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Professor</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent, En el Cargo</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney, Abogado</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action, Escriptor, Movimiento Socialista</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Community Service Attorney, Abogado de Servicio Publico</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT NORMAN</td>
<td>Health Administrator, Administrador de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>Political Consultant, Consultor Politico</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman, Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnologico</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Nomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant/Consultor Administrativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/ Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician/Musico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado, Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman/Vendedor de Bienes y Raices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary/Secretaria Administrativa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/ Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator / Especialista en Ciencias Politicas / Educador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer / Profesor de Economia / Escritor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/ Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker/Banquero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor/Ejecutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant / Militante Sindical Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative / Representante de Ventas de Directores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>ANDREW &quot;DADDY ANDY&quot; JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student/Estudiante de SFCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important:** There are two (2) pages of candidates for Supervisor. (29 candidates, vote for 6)

**Note:** 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent, Education Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent, Education Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Director,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director de Servicios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunitarios, Education Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Truck Operator,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductor de Camiones,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and Teacher,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestra y Madre de Familia,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Public Accountant,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Consultant,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contador Público, Consultero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant, Education Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent, Education Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Tranvia Municipales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent En el Carga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent En el Carga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent En el Carga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST &quot;CHUCK&quot; AYALA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent En el Carga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Actor Maestro/Actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Central Committeeman Miembro del Comité Central del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant Funcionario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUP BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SENIOR CENTER BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION. FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS EXCLUSION. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SUPREME COURT. TRANSFER OF CAUSES. REVIEW OF DECISIONS. Modifies existing constitutional provisions regarding transfer of causes and review of decisions. Fiscal Impact: No significant effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>賛成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>賛成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>賛成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>賛成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.

**LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoría de las escuelas públicas.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar el medio las substancias peligrosas.

**LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALUBRE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejoría de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $650,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.

**FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS.** Ofrece poder a la Legislatura para excluir de revaluación del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejorías recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser levantada a pago, pérdidas en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de $5 millones anuales, además del gasto del gobierno estatal para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de impuesto a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en el ingreso proveniente del impuesto a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.

**Corte Suprema, Transferencia de Causas, Revisión de Decisiones.** Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigencia en cuanto al traslado de causas y la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.

---

### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

**一九八四年清潔用水公債法案。本法案規定發行公債三億二千五百萬元 ($325,000,000)，提供基金，用作控制水污染、保護水源和廢水回收工程。**

**一九八四年州校舍租購公債法案。本法案規定發售公債四億五千萬元 ($450,000,000)，提供資金用作興建或改善公立學校。**

**清理危險物質公債法案。本法案規定發行公債一億元 ($100,000,000)，提供基金用作清理危險物質。**

**一九八四年加州安全食水公債法案，本法案規定發售公債七千五百萬元 ($75,000,000)，提供基金用作改良家庭用水系統，以符合最低限度的食水標準。**

**一九八四年退休人員公債法案。本法案規定發售公債六億五千萬元 ($650,000,000)，提供資金用作援助加州退休人員購買農場和房屋。**

**一九八四年耆英中心公債法案，本法案規定發行公債五千萬元 ($50,000,000)，提供基金，用作興建耆英中心。**

物業稅，消防系統稅免，授權州議會豁免某些新建的消防改進項目於物業稅重估。財政影響：這項提案如獲通過，地方政府須向州政府支付補償款，這些開支需用於補償地方校區的物業稅損失；物業稅的扣稅額減少，州政府所得稅收入會增加。

最高法院。案件的轉移及判決的複審。修訂現在憲法中關於轉移案件和複審判決的條款。財政影響：沒有顯著影響。
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON. Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION. Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

(Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot)

TAXATION. Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

STATE LOTTERY. Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY. Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

33 POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a postergar los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por su dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales los cuales serían recuperados, con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

34 FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ESTRUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Excluye del recaudación del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que sean estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdida para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

35 La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

36 FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar. Dispone reembolsos especiales de impuestos, impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales de por lo menos $100 millones anuales, durante el primer periodo de dos años. Aumento en los costos estatales de hasta $750 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsiguientes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para la escuela. Pérdida para otras agencias locales, además de para la escuela, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $1.2 mil millones anuales, durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años subsiguientes.

37 LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública será de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: jardín de infantes al 12° grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

38 MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN, INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador urja a los oficiales federales a que omitan la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.
**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, GENERAL ELECTION, NOVEMBER 6, 1984**

### REAPPORTIONMENT
Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 237</th>
<th>NO 238</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS
Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate's personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 242</th>
<th>NO 243</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 247</th>
<th>NO 248</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

#### A
Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 253</th>
<th>NO 254</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 256</th>
<th>NO 257</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES 259</th>
<th>NO 260</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos para 1986 y para las elecciones subsequently mediante nueva comisión compuesto de anteriores jueces. Impacto fiscal. Costos de la comisión de hasta $3.5 millones antes de la elección de 1986. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada uno para reubicar un número desconocido de oficinas legislativas en los distritos. Costos del condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1986. Ahores para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1986 por costos de impresión y $250,000 cada dos años de ahi en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPAÑÍAS. Limita a los contribuyentes y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos políticos electivos. Iguala con fondos públicos limitados las gastos personales del candidato de oposición. Impacto fiscal. Reduce los ingresos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente hasta $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite cambios legislativos. Impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y condados comenzando el 1ro de julio de 1986. El tamaño de la reducción impacto en los diferentes niveles del gobierno es imposible determinarse en este momento. Reducciones substanciales bajo Programas específicos serían parciales; se compensarían hasta un grado en seguida mediante el aumento de gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite cambios legislativos. Impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y condados comenzando el 1ro de julio de 1986. El tamaño de la reducción impacto en los diferentes niveles del gobierno es imposible determinarse en este momento. Reducciones substanciales bajo Programas específicos serían parciales; se compensarían hasta un grado en seguida mediante el aumento de gastos bajo otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

PROPOSIÇIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO 市縣提案

- 253 SI 贷成 A ¿Debe ser autorizado a la Comisión del Pueto a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

- 256 SI 贷成 B ¿Debe ser autorizado a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Aguas?

- 259 SI 贷成 C ¿Debe ser creadada una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales y los demás servicios de salud del Conrado, y para nombrar a un Director de Salud Pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Núm.</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>Posición</td>
<td>Explicación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>應否授權退休委員會作退休基金投資時，可用個人判斷謹慎行事，而不必限於作法律許保険公司所作的投資？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>市政府給在職身故或退休後去世的僱員的遺偶的保健福利金，應否與在職或退休僱員的津貼相同？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagarse un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueren como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y período de empleo?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>在工作中或在工作範圍內身體遭受暴力引致的外傷而殉職的各類官員和僱員，應否支付十二個月薪額的死亡撫恤金？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>¿Deberá el período probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>應否延長警員的試用期，即從加入警局起一年延至完成訓練後一年的時間，但不能超過八十四個星期？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagarse un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>應否給予警局駕駛兩輪摩托車的警員額外報酬，其數額根據加州有 350,000 人口的城市此種報酬的平均數而定？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que pregunte a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un exceso gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(創制法令)；舊金山應否要求聯邦政府詢問所有納稅人的意見是否願意讓他們的稅款用在過度的軍事費用上，並由市政府每年刊印一份報告，詳列有關聯邦在舊金山所徵稅款，以及用於過度軍事目的和用於社會需要的部分？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningún fondo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(政策聲明)；舊金山應否制訂政策，規定市政府管理的退休基金不能投資在與南非有商業關係的商號，直至南非廢除種族隔離，給予黑人充分的政治權利和民權為止？</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de 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.”

STEP 1

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

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

C 第二步
請記選票插入時，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 perforre con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把帶銫之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic” y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

B 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your address when you signed up to vote,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

BONDS—Contracts to borrow and repay money.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as "Permanent Absentee Voters". A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
"IT APPEARS TO BE ONE END OF THE NOVEMBER 7 SAN FRANCISCO BALLOT..."

Reprinted by permission of the San Francisco Chronicle.

(Because there are no BART candidates in your district this page would otherwise have been blank.)
JOHN SALEH ABDULLA

My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city's acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:

Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononica, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabrao, 3609-18th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulghum, 487 Joost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O'Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhya S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative, Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O'Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO

My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco's Charter permits supervisorial inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:

L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programmer/analyst
Rose Violet Desocio, 213 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdra D. Dunlop, 125 DeMontfort Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garm, 2347-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glynn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-15th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Kochler, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cherwenne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Topeka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemar, 125 Cambon Dr., Retired-Producer Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Petty Randall, 360 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampiera, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-15th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thomason, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman
Candidates for Supervisor

ROGER BOSCHETTI
My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

RICHHARD BRADLEY
My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spike Reagan's anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Bell, 1928 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 631 O'Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Cotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviotia Way, Nationally Known Referee/ Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1438-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2655 Chestnut St., Goldengate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilsen, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1324 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allston St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzivista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zyga, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cordland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennysy Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

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

HARRY BRITT

My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
• I’ve supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gang violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sara Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ario Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sa Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant’s Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Dr., Senior Citizen’s Advocate
John Holzczlau, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louis Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women’s Political Caucus
Leon Bruschen, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Andrea Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Verano St., West Portal Avenue
Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER

My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.

Muni Fare/Past Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portland-Free buses downtown.

We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni’s cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!

You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.

Please call 864-8641 if you’d like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.

If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Dornacke, 6 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tuncal, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Pena, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 255 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Pannillno, 312 Preita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burnsie, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malveux, 26 Winfield St., Economist

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

My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54

My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner; President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods; Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor's Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture / Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
- Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
- Crime-free streets
- Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
- Caring solutions to seniors' needs.
- Eliminating Bay pollution.
- Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan Bulkley

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:

Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandez, 464-42nd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2901 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louie J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravanis, 74 Mipah St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Hausted, 1308 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n.
Don Hornsey, 84 Kelloch Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirckwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kuhns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Reality House West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 3767-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Raznich, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tung, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary’s Park Improvement Club

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Braulty, 1 Ardath Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikemugi, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 414-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennyce Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

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

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services

My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor’s Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:

Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Bacci, 2478-23rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachael Blyeat, 2323 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1528 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Cassano, 863 Carolina St., Artist
Tony DeLacorte, 2025 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Deming St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 105-12th Ave., Attorney at Law
Adrien Belli Falk, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Fine Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 582 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. Jabe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Keating, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirtley, 1344 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kushner, 33 Presidio Terr., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Lau, 50-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 17 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rowell, 1319-5th Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Strauss, 1734-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debbie Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph’s Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary’s College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d’Ottillie, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d’Ottillie, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gilmore, 135 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Av., Banker
Marcia Kessel, 44 Mallorca Way, Bank Clerk
Bernice Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D. MacGillivray, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McManus, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 36 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Phipps, 230 Prospect Ave., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whitelaw, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM
My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.

I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.

Pathetic Wendy Nelder says "Fluoride causes AIDS"; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with "Oh What a Night" bacalaiila; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.

San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche's NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Fainjo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallon Ave., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Leccano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

RUBY T. JIMENEZ
My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican decent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bohnske, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fainjo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 93 Prentiss St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andre Kenitzer Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Orn Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Leccano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Ruth Mattis, 638 Sawyer St., Office Clerk
Patricia McDonagh, 385-28th St., Housewife
Thomas McDonagh, 385-28th St., Construction
Ruth E. Rosenberg, 165 Parnassus Ave., Instructor
Leticia Wickersham, 171 Precita Ave.
Lupe D. Zamudio, 274 Broad St., Sales Representative

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDREW (“DADDY ANDY”) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I’m involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singart partents resource center. I’ve been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as “Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Major Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I’d like to deacivate my Supervior campaigne to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

The sponsors for Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones are:

Stephen Harold Irvine, 2037 15th St., Carpenter
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Joseph A. DelCarlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Chairperson of MHD
David L. Butler, 895 Shotwell St., Salesman
Diane Moananu, 43 Watchman Way, Graduate Student
David Levinson, MD, 2927 Folsom St., Physician
Helen Butler, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired Cashier
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect
Rose Sillard, 10 Lucky St., Housewife
John Marx, 20-12th St., Student
Donald Strickland, 981 Shotwell St., Musician & Carpenter
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Hiring Hall Director
Oscar Herrera, 360 Holyoke St., Educator
Delmar T. Burge, 142 Central Ave., Professional Musician
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Jesse S. Valencie, 751 Castro St., Job Developer
Peter Anthony Rivera, 57 Peters Ave., Counselor
Fernando Costa, 177 Johnstone Dr., Executive Director
Miguel Quinone, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Social Worker
Harry W. Madison, 4017 Folsom St., Appliance Repair
Paul Sussman, 1243 Third Ave., Housing Finance
Carmencita L. De la Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Kathryn M. McCamant, 625 Scott St., Tenant Organizer
Lynne Benson, 2135-28th Ave., Grants Coordinator
Harry E. Baker, 1345 Clement St., Project Coordinator

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:

Diinne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1209 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Stolar Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Borise, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Brit, 783-A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1056 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lars, 1777 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 556-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillitties St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY keyes

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyes" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyes". Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-38th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator,
   Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmel, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McClintic St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 326-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moebis, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Mooij, 1223 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and
   Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.
I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.
San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:

Carlos Altimirano, 750 Sweeny St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altimirano, 750 Sweeny St., Retired
Graciela Altimirano, 750 Sweeny St., Student
Leticia Altimirano, 750 Sweeny St., College Student
Philip A. Bellich, 3256 Folson St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elvira Hurdy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales
   Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Rabbon St., Foster Mother
Marela K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lida G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozzitis, 1350 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

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

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your "financial watchdog" in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sula Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Cabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francisco, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2600 O'Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Mardikian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-16th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1425 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bodd Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Haarlet C. Salaro, 9 Crestlade Dr., Self Employed Businesswoman
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Vukich, 177 San Aliso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:

* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Mosecone Center

As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks

You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arballo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobrowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Montecillo, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philoemena Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kellogg St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richmond Loewinson, 1541 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Lorett, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Berniece Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan Mc Curdy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1541 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Schectman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker

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

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: Native San Francisco and former White House staffer (1977-78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisors
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Judith Breckin’ 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Cazenave, 282-22nd St., Housing Advocacy
Terence Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gannon, 3649-18th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shrader St., Arbitrator
Roberto Y. Hernandez, 852 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doris W. Kahn, 3259 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblenz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orelia Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Latham, 2380-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Diao Reece, 203-46th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnapp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Franco M. Shukian, 259-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Otisso St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 56 Fernando Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. StCy’ 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME
Local 2600
Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.

For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1770 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louis K. Molinari, 361 26th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 549 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Rosselli, 549 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salarino, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

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

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Pricilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zula F. Atuana, 141 Alton St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 55 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2200 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 180 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Richard G. Gusman, 168 Sutter St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2766-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane McCaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coloradie St., Educator/Administrator
Tia A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1845-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executive (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Francisco, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:

Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lottl, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelita Sheehan, 436-21th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2250-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 525-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shinmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economon, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lottl, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-4th Ave., Retired
Roger Bashetti, 801-4th Ave., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th St., Secretary
Ralph A. Bars, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1255-22nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyers, Jr, 3322 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shadr St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 25 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-10th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sani Keskeline, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
LOUISE RENNE
My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.
At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).
My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.
As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shredder St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattle J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Maginn, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Fillbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanton, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER
My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
—Parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.
—My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.
—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—Preserving sunlight in parks
—Outlawing gay discrimination
—Creating low and moderate income housing
—Repairing City streets and buildings
—Rent control
—Protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—Reducing smog
—Preserving San Francisco Bay
—Expanding Muni
—Wheelchair accessibility
—More women and minorities receiving City contracts
—Child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Maginn, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnost, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1217 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2300-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Daytonot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teressa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4000-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kiltyrow, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Tp., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

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

DAVID C. SMITH

My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city's growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:
James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Welt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Welt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer
Robert P. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Edgy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-114 Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-114 Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgs, 270 Juana Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McCuehan, 1230 La Playa St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. Mollhenney, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pong, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurateur
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

KEVIN STARR

My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:
Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Altschuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Biradelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur
Sam Camhi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caufield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Violet L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 605 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Headley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 251 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorwin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roanne Mankin, 2314 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3373 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38
John N. Rosekrans, Jr, 2840 Broadway , Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salano, 9 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strunsky, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

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

JOHN E. WAHL

My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.

I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.

I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Caroline W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sanford, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucay, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 88 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126-22nd St., Clergyperson
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kurlander, 115 San Ateo, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscoth, 156 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jenny G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughn, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenview St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 808-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 52 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary
Jeanette Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant
Julieta V. De Chavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58
My qualifications for office are: My program:

Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers’ residences.

Door-key children of working parents, denied childcare, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.

Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 588-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Elnor, 615 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St, Retail Clerk
William G. Lewis, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Meniashe, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda I. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessee St., Machinist
Karen A. Schieve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Setian, 1564-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Poster or Clerk
David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

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

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Dennis, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicia Wang, 1416 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishhacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell L. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAllister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD

DICK CERBATOS
My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focusing on education. As an engineer business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.
As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.
I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.
I am committed to excellence in education.
A. Richard Cerbatos

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON
My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.
For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.
I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.
I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.
Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1203 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
A1 Borovice, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judy Della Monica, 3232 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Espea, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Haisted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas E. Hora, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President, ILGWU
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILGWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yoni Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:
Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1709-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Junior Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Dela Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Lisa Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Leona M. Quintana, 3331 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 333 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, R. Wilkerson, 1347-13th Ave., Cashier

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

My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member

My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.

I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.

There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.

Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denbein

The sponsors for Libby Denbeim are:
Robert S. Denbeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agatos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 880 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Cobelntz, 10th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2838 Green St., Community Leader
Carlota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zaretti L. Gooby, 29 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3383 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Miedan, 561-26th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinaro, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castita Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Rafal, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Lederer
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yuri Wada, 505-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pamz Ponzo Waller, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Wans, 270 Seacull Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.

I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.

Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:
Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Cerrato, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Auria, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaula, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 850-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Ison, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escondido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-11 Ave., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mipah St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mess, M.D., 55 Lundy's Ln., AIDS Clinical-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1352-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quaekenbush, 1699-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED

Mervyn E. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monteclair St., Attorney
Michael Stepanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Haitian, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerklin, 1326-26th Ave., Editor

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

MARTIN ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant

My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues

Eng supports:
• Our children’s inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.

Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.

Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:

John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Deslens Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Belli, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fong, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pausing, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palmos Dr., Real Estate Finance, Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McHenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
P. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Petersonisle, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-38th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alioto, 2896 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Coret Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician

My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:

Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agrino C. Cerabertos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palmos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Maffes, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbaum, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Rae G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heathier Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave, Axt Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor

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

My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy's Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: "We're going to the moon in ten years!" Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60's have given way to the "other-directedness" of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elhora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legard, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezzano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blinken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozzatis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

JAMES LEGARE

My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—on the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:
1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for James Legare are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elhora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Lezzano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blinken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejo, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozzatis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

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

JO ANNE MILLER

My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher
My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:

Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fries, 830-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearn, 1050 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Daro Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Cleve Jones, 30-18th St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 225 Sutter St., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 555 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingersoll Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Evergreen St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAOFM

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst
My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active-parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 288 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinari, 36-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William R. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hom, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Myra Groff, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sondia Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 2895 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ERNEST "CHUCK" AYALA

My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administrating Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest “Chuck” Ayala are:
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chubot St., House Wife
Marjorie M. Colvin, 1835 Franklin St., #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatoom, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulka, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lubeitch, 15 Florentine St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman-Retired
Louise H. Rennie, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Roualdes, 340-A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thomatara N. Scott, 1912-16 Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Police Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3300 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorzakis, 545 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN

My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Dennard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grandvel A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Lauraretset Kerk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renni, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Malcolm M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiltirius St., Minister
Hannah A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

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

My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committeeman, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: • Am married, father of three children and a homeowner • Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco • Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeman (since 1970) • California State Central Committeeman (since 1978) • Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferraro • Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee • Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program • Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O’Dowd • Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committeee • Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall • Successfully fought peripheral canal • Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

DEAN GOODMAN

My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64
My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator’s concern for quality instruction, and a citizen’s awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.
If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 908 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I Balman, 5 Peregio Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kimo Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Clement, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Laurel Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergren Kalb, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Murie St., Attorney
Donald J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1657 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nomura, 177 Bocan St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Win-Bell Olsen, 1283 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Trantham, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Sigrid Wurschmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 29th Ave., Businessman

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attourney
Lee S. Dolson, 178 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2985-4th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francos, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Moore, 1760-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman
Clara Stein, 2330 Slont Blvd., Cashier
Brian J. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Sue T. Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., State Central Committeewoman
Mildred K. Bird, 1762-17th Ave., Retired
Mary Ann Cowen, 134 Detroit St., Secretary
Charles T. Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., Retired
Emily H. Shimmey, 19 Middlefield St., Housewife
Thomas P. Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., Displayman
Esther F. Zlott, 75 Middlefield St., Retired
Peter B. Paragas, 1923 San Jose Ave., Engineering Graduate
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Adriano Biagiotti, 131 Detroit St., Retired
Ann Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, City College Graduate
Kenneth J. Lukas, 215 Detroit St., Carpenter
Lloyd A. Quan, 90 Staples St., Retired
Louise E. Quan, 96 Staples St., Retired
William T. Bray, 207 San Juan Ave., Gatemana
Mary B. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Homemaker
Lisa L. Klobuchar, 153 San Felipe Way, County Central Committeewoman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
Jim Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Arlo H. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDRE F. PEHARGO
My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulos, 59 Prague St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd, Retired
Josephine Buechholtz, 353 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 487 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 820 Banks St., Supervisor
Alice Crover, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Flahavon, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigue, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hantman, 361 23th Ave., Teacher
Ruse Hantman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Pauline Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Keplinger, 3832 Fulton St., Concierge
Anna Koron, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtman Kovach, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 37 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG
My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chair, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Don M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'Connell, 50 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Annice C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer St., Planning Commissioner
Agnipino R. Cerbates, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical-Engineer
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Bellise Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 66 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Betty W. Lundis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

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

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the faculty and administration whose main responsibility is superior teaching for professional and occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing and challenging; therefore community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:

Lilian Aldea, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Busto, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Busto, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 15 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion P. Cespedes, 951 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odella Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felisa P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Wille B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Pownash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 192 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board
My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:

Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Wille Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Ansaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sodonia Wilson, 340 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Agripino R. Ceballos, 471 Hoffman Ave, School Board Member
Carbota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliris St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 420-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 300 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

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

PROPOSITION A
Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$42,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>81,761,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$124,261,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco's income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That's the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City's fishing fleet at Fisherman's Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City's future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto
Port Revenue Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves.

We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Salu Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman’s Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But . . . times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo;

providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, 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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fisherman's Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman's Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

Christopher Martin  
President, Fisherman's Wharf Merchant Assoc.
Fritz Arko
Alessandro Baccari  
Ex. Secretary, Fisherman's Wharf Merchant Assoc.
L. B. Barnes
Fisherman's Wharf Seafood
Phil Bentivegna
Fishing Boat Butchie B
Bob Bugatto
California Shell Fish Co.
Ken Burger
Franciscan Restaurant
Pat Flanagan
Standard Fisheries
Anthony Casali
Fishing Boat Norene
Virgil P. Caselli, Native  
S. Joseph Cincotta
F. Alioto Fish Co.
Nick D'Amato
Fishing Boat Nicky D
Nino Geraldi
Tom Lazio
Tom Lazio Fish Co.
Andrew Lolli
William McDonnell
Albert Spadaro
Sports Fishing Boat
New Flories
Mario J. Alioto
Calif. Seafood Institute
Peter Brown
The Anchorage

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!

Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don't let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
Sec/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twomey, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And...AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors

Phyllis Kern  
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women's Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks and Recreation in Chinatown*

Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only

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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Port Revenue Bonds

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray
Doris Thomas

J. E. Thomas
A. Brooks
Frankie Gillette
Lois DeCayette
Joel DeCayette
Jule Anderson
Altheda Carrie
George Newkirk
Elouise Westbrook
Shirley Jones
Clifton Jeffers
Joe Williams
Carol Belle
Benjamin James
Grandvel Jackson
Amos Brown
Faye Anderson
Zuretti Goosby
Stan Palomares-Criollo
Jene Rita Alvai
Ernest C. Ayala
Alan S. Wong
Stan Moy
Douglas S. Chan
Thomas Hsieh
Alicia Wang
Ben Tom
Pius Lee
Julie Tang
Louis Hop Lee
Dennis Wong
Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco’s maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco’s competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America’s Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee
Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a “fast track”, it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by “letter agreements” with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no-long term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn’t even secured written “letter agreements” from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman’s Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It’s like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don’t have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco’s piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?  

YES 256  NO 257

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

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

- Bond redemption  $104,000,000
- Bond interest      169,260,000
- Total debt service requirement $273,260,000

“Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
PROPOSITION C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City’s Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer’s auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor’s control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a “yes” vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can’t something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General’s “major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc.” Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of “a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance” as a cause for “ineffective management.”

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Louise Renne

Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Brit
Supervisor Doris Ward

Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

(Continued)
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. As more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department’s role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors’ needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Department’s services. As more and more block grants transfer health programs from the state and federal levels to local governments, the Department will become an increasingly important provider to women.

Proposition C gives women an opportunity to make their voices heard at the highest levels of the Health Department. And our voices must be heard if services are to be organized efficiently and responsively.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, nonprofit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society
Robert Aaron, M.D.
Robert Gross, M.D.
Molly Coye, M.D.
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.
Maureen Katz, M.D.
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.

James Cole, M.D.
John Good, M.D.
Jeff Sandler, M.D.
Judy Keeven, M.D.
Robert Dickter, D.D.S.
Jeffrey Draizin, M.D.
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.
Brad Evans, M.D.

Lars Erickson, M.D.
Randy Yanda, M.D.
Stephen Collins, M.D.
Lewis Pepper, M.D.
Mark Smith, M.D.
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obliged to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli
John Mehring
Del Martin
Donald Cataland
Cleve Jones
Randy Stallings

Richard Allman
Jeff Jones
Phyllis Lyon
Debra Friedland
Robert Estevess

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz
Rafael Cedillos
Maria Degado
Roberto Hernandez
Joanna Devito-Larson
Rosa Maria Clos
Susan Houston
Arnell Rodrigues
P. Braveman, M.D.
Alfredo Rodrigues
Sonia Melara
Joseph Tanner
Edgar Quiroz
Angel Couteras

Roger Hernandez
Tom Romero
Raphael Tafajarro
Juanita DelCarlo
Juan Pifarre
Rudolph Mathias
Rolph Hurtado
Alfredo Rivas
Vilma Mondoza
O. Bracker
Ray Rivera
Lorenzo Dill
Yolanda Cameros
Monica Asturias

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

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO's opposition is understandable. He simply doesn't want to lose control of the Health Department and SP General.

UC's opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10–15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission? Let's clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Fred Ross
James O'Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Yoachum
D.J. Soviero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
JoAnne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O'Driscoll
Nicerita Reveo

Beatrice Patterson
Thomas Ambroggi
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Peter Hanson
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken McEldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holitzlaw

Paul Vacaralli
Al Cassiato
Alan Raznick
James Haas
Al Borvice
Essie Webb
Joan Moulton
Russell Zellers
Stanley Shields
Richard Sevilla
Ann Daley
Dorothy Labudde
Dorice Murphy
Howard Strassner
Mark Davalos
Larry Griffin

Jay Wallace
Rob Waters
Kevin Malone
Jan Holloway
Norman Rolfe
Tom Jones
Barbara Halliday
Sandra Powell
Deborah Sarvis
Esther Marks
James Augustino
Sharon Johnson
Eileen Adams
Ruth Gravanis
Michael Heffer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium
Myles Dixon
George Dykstra
Susan Ehrlich
Patricia Franks
Debra Friedland
Kate Lambert

Mike Pincus
David Smith, M.D.
Marlin Waukzoo
Jerome West
Sophie Wong
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Patti Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics.

But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department's policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be ad-dressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a “commission” to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City’s health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was “to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION.” (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be “protected from political influence as largely as possible...” and “it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence.” Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a “seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure.” To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that “the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management.” Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board's reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administrative structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a "crisis-to-crisis" basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco's health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city's health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote "No" on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city's highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital's AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city's health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a "strong mayor" type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.
2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services.

Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain

the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let’s do it—“Now,” not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department’s health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer’s budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer’s Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco’s health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; 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.

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

(Continued on page 82)
PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?  YES  261 ▼ NO  262 ▼

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments. Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serves a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System's investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain rigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It's logical. That's why I recommend a "yes" vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPPOSITION D

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name __________________________________________________________

Address ___________________________________________ Apt. # _____

Telephone No. (required) ________________________________

Do you have an automobile?    yes □    no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) __________________________________

Signature _____________________________________________________
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?

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

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County’s share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman
Legislative Committee, Retired Employees
City & County of San Francisco
Helen McAtee, Chairperson
Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse’s pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your “YES” vote on Proposition “E” on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President
Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let’s extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED.
PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of members and retired persons of the parking authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972 6, 1984 shall be effective July 1, 1973 1985.
Employee Death Benefits

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?

YES 267
NO 268

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”
Employee Death Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let's agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member's contributions to the system, plus six months' salary.

Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months' salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

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

8.509 Retirement—Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

A(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

(Continued on page 84)
Police Probationary Period

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>270</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller's Statement on “G”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatchers, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatchers.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casiato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City’s parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally-perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

YES 278

NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of “excessive military expenditures”, as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I
APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers’ money for a handful of misguided individuals?

City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION I

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:
(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as “star-war” weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).
(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.
(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.

Section 2. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco shall notify the President of the United States, the Vice-President, all members of the President's Cabinet, and all members of Congress: that it is the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on the Federal Government to ask all Federal taxpayers, at the time they report their federal taxes, whether they wish that any part of their tax contribution be used for excessive military expenditures. This policy shall also be published for the people of San Francisco in major city newspapers.

Section 3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall be responsible for the publication of an annual report citing the amount of all federal tax monies collected from San Francisco taxpayers. This annual report shall include the following amounts:
(a) total federal tax revenues contributed by all San Francisco taxpayers;
(b) portion of the revenues in (a) budgeted for any type of military expenditures;
(c) portion of revenues in (a) budgeted for excessive military expenditures;
(d) portion of revenues in (a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) average individual tax contribution;
(f) average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen's Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen's Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned Peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.
South African Investment Policy

PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283

NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminable but possibly substantial amount.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mormen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Bradford Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure.

(Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said "foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism." As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J"

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid "a crime against humanity"; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN -ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Rev. Cecil Williams
Dr. Thomas Ambrogi
Dr. Norman Leach
Rev. Glenda Hope
Rev. Jean Richardson
Rev. Robert Cromey
Rev. Stanley Stefancic
Rev. James Clairor
Rev. Pamela White
First Congregational Church
Rev. Kenneth Westray
Rev. Pilonio Walker
Rev. Charles Lewis
Rev. Matthew Fong
Rev. Donald Stuart
Rev. Lloyd Wake

Lia Belli
Democratic Candidate,
State Senate

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Todd Roust
Republican State Senate Nominee
Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

One Retirement Board “success” was the purchase of 10,000 shares of Citicorp for $3,473,320. The shares on 3/30/84 were worth $340,000 (90% loss).

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-People’s Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on. . . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

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

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

And to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged so that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters' pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

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 engineering, 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 or 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.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating theretoo, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
traffic safety education;
(b) to receive, study and give prompt
attention to complaints relating to street
design or traffic devices or the absence
thereof;
(c) to collect, compile, analyze and in-
terpret traffic and parking data and to
analyze and interpret traffic accident in-
formation;
(d) to engage in traffic research and
traffic planning; and
(e) to cooperate for the best perfor-
manoe of these functions with any de-
partment and agency of the city and
county and the state as may be neces-
sary.
The department shall submit to the
traffic bureau of the police department, for
its review and recommendation, all pro-
posed plans relating to street control
devices; provided, however, that the bu-
reau may waive submission and review of
plans of particular devices designated by it.
Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit
to the department its recommendation on
any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days
after receipt shall be considered an au-
omatic approval of said traffic bureau.
The department shall not, with respect to any
traffic control devices, implement such
plan until the recommendation of the
traffic bureau has been reviewed or until
the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.
Department of Electricity, which shall
be administered by a chief of department.
The premises of any person, firm or cor-
morization of the city and county upon paying a fair
compensation for such connection and the use
of the same, provided that any such con-
nection 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 rec-
ommendation of the chief of the depart-
ment.
Department of Public Health, which
shall be administered by a director of
health, who shall be a regularly licensed
physician or surgeon in the State of Cali-
fornia, with not less than 10 years' practice
in his profession immediately preceding his
appointment thereto; provided, however,
that the physician or surgeon requirement
may be waived by the board of supervisors.
He shall be appointed by the chief admin-
istrative officer and shall hold office at his
pleasure.
The chief administrative officer shall
have power to appoint and to remove an
assistant director of public health for hos-
pital services, who shall be responsible for
the administrative and business manage-
ment of the institutions of the department
of public health, including, but not limited
to, the San Francisco General Hospital,
Laguna Honda Home, Hassler Health
Home, and the Emergency Hospital Ser-
vice, and who shall be exempt from the
civil service provisions of the charter. The
position of assistant director of public
health for hospital services shall be held
only by a person who possesses the edu-
cational and administrative qualifications
and experience necessary to manage the
institutions of the department of public
health.
The director of public health shall have
power to appoint and remove an admin-
istrator of San Francisco General Hospital
who shall be exempt from the civil service
provisions of the charter. The position of
administrator shall be held only by a phy-
sician or hospital administrator who pos-
sesses the educational and administrative
qualifications and experience necessary to
manage the San Francisco General Hospi-
tal.
Health Advisory Board. There is hereby
created a health advisory board of seven
members, three of whom shall be physi-
cians and one dentist, all regularly certifi-
ced. Members of the board shall serve
without compensation. They shall be ap-
pointed by the chief administrative officer
for terms of four years; provided, however,
that those first appointed shall classify
themselves by lot so that the terms of one
physician and one lay member shall expire
in 1973, 1974 and 1975, respectively, and
the term of one member in 1976.
Such board shall consider and report on
problems and matters under the jurisdic-
tion of the department of public health and
shall consult, advise with and make rec-
ommendations to the director of health rel-
ative to the functions and affairs of the de-
partment. The recommendations of such
board shall be made in writing to the di-
rector of health and to the chief admin-
istrative officer.
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 agricul-
tural commissioner and shall include func-
tions 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 per-
sonnel of the office of sealer of weights and
measures as established at the time this
charter shall go into effect.
Convention Facilities Management De-
partment, which shall include the city and
county's convention facilities, including but
not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditor-
ium and Moscone Center, and shall con-
sist of a general manager and such em-
ployees as may be necessary to carry out
the functions and duties of said depart-
ment. The chief administrative officer shall
have charge of the department of conven-
tion facilities management.
The chief administrative officer shall ap-
point a general manager of the convention
facilities management department who
shall hold office at his pleasure. The gen-
eral manager shall be the administrative
head and appointing officer of the depart-
ment of convention facilities management.
Subject to the approval of the chief admin-
istrative officer, the general manager shall
have power to alter, repair, manage, op-
erate and maintain all of the city and
county convention facilities, including but
not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditor-
ium and Moscone Center. All contracts or
orders for work to be performed on conv-
tion facilities shall be awarded and ex-
cuted by the general manager with the ap-
proval 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 man-
agement to manage, operate and maintain
all of the city and county convention facili-
ties, including, but not limited to, Brooks
Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Cen-
ter.
If in the election of June 3, 1980, Novem-
ber 6, 1984 two or more propositions
amending section 3.510 of this charter re-
cieve 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.
PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COM-
MISSION
3.695 Composition of Department; Com-
mision
The public health department shall con-
sist of a health commission, a director of
public health and such employees as shall
be necessary and appointed pursuant to the
provisions of this charter. The department
shall be under the management of a health
commission consisting of seven members
who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said
commission shall have less than a majority
of direct providers of health care. Direct
providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, anyone who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less that a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the re-
retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

“Benefit” shall include “allowance,” “retirement allowance,” and “death benefit.”

“Average final compensation” shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the term “misdemeanor or officer, or employee,” or “member,” as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

“Retirement system” or “system” shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

“Retirement board” shall mean “retirement board” as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

“Charter” shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural and the plural the singular.

“Interest” shall mean interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

B (b) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection G (g) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member’s retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection C (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within thirty 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five 65 years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county’s contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county’s contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

E (e) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in subsection G (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection A (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowance shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

D (d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workmen's compensation laws of the State of California.

E (e) If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

a (A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

b (B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this subsection E (e), for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this subsection E (e), any allowance payable under this subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members;

F (f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system,
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1 2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

G (g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

1. Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

2. Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

3. Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

4. Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

5. The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and services rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore shall be required of the city and county.

H (h) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

1. There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7 1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deduced, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(c) and 8.509(f).

2. Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

3. The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

4. The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection H (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1) of subsection H (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be
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made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision § (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date herof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(1) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection B (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said subsection B (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(2) No person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as a election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(3) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), e (e), F (f) and (l) (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system any annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(a) If no benefit is payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 48 eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 48 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 48 eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 48 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 48 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 48 eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(1) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(2) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 48 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this section, any allowance payable under this Subsection (b) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in Subsection (a) of Section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of 18 eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person's child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

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

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period.

The civil service commission shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police department fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for one-year twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments, the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his to the position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the Board of Supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrician patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum average certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefore shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in Subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in Section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrician patrol officers” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in Subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen classification in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen classification in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation earnable" as used in section 8.549.

The term "firemen" "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation of the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, patrol officers or firemen; firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods therefore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increases for the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
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.

A 第一步

B 第二步

C 第三步

D 第四步

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

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 lápices.

贝第二步

佰第三步

附把雪歸之選舉針自小孔內垂直插入打孔投票

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name __________________________________________________________

Address ________________________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) _________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) _________________________________

Signature ______________________________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:
請將一份缺席選票給本人，以參加選舉

---

PRINTED NAME-LETRAS DE IMPRENTA- 正楷書寫姓名

SIGNATURE-FIRMA- 申請人簽名

RESIDENCE ADDRESS-RESIDENCIA DIRECCION- 住址

DATE-FECHA- 日期

---

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:

---

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER
Permanent Absentee Voter

For Registrar's Use Only

Prep. No. __________________
A.V. Prep. No. _____________
Ballot Type ________________
Affidavit No. _______________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

---

EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
GENERAL ELECTION

5th Congressional District
3rd Senate District
16th Assembly District
(No BART)

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊登在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
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Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters
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PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTOunicamente con el picador atado en la cuerda al registrador; no use pluma ni lapiz.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "Sí" o después de la palabra "No".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfura, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請用針在投票紀錄器上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

投票位所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上箭頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上箭頭所指之所有候選人中，選擇您要投票的候選人打孔，但不要超過您選票的規定人數。

投票合格的非候選人請在非候選人選票信封所提供的預定空間上寫入候選人所競選的職位和您的姓名。

投票任何提案，請在選票上箭頭所指"YES"或"NO"字樣打孔。

選票上若有顯著污點或折損者，選票作廢。

如果您在選票上打孔錯了，撕破或弄壞了，撕破了非候選人打孔的選票信封，應把該選票送還給選舉區的監選員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td>for President, for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td>for President, for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td>for President, for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td>for President, for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td>for President, for Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative 5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOSA,</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accountant</td>
<td>for Congress, for District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY CLARK,</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
<td>for Congress, for District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG,</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td>for Congress, for District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALA BURTON,</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress, 5th District</td>
<td>for Congress, for District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL</td>
<td>州參議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Senator</strong></td>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILTON MARKS, Republican</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL KANGAS, Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIA BELL, Democratic</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK PICKENS, Libertarian</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA</th>
<th>州衆議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member of the State Assembly</strong></td>
<td>16th District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS, Republican</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS, Democratic</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City and County of SAN FRANCISCO

GENERAL ELECTION
6 DI NOVIEMBRE DE 1994

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

Vote por Uno
Vote for One
NOTE: 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES
Member, Board of Supervisors

HARRY BRITT
Member, Board of Supervisors
Membro, Junta de Supervisores

RICHARD BRADLEY
Socialist Union Militant
Militante Sindicalista

RANDALL BRONNER
Artist, Musician
Artista / Músico

JONATHAN BULKLEY
Architect / Neighborhood Planner
Arquitecto / Planificador

ROGER BOSCHETTI
T.V. Ethnic Producer
Productor de Programas Étnicos de Televisión

KEVIN STARR
Businessman, Communicator, Professor
Hombre de Negocios, Comunicador, Profesor

CAROL RUTH SILVER
Incumbent
En el Cargo

DAVID C. SMITH
Administrator, Service Agency
Escritor, Movimiento Socialista

JOHN E. WAHL
Attorney
Abogado

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN
Writer, Socialist Action
Escríbir, Movimiento Socialista

DAVE WHARTON
Community Service Attorney
Abogado de Servicio Público

PAT NORMAN
Health Administrator
Administrador de Servicios de Salud

ROBERT D. INGRAHAM
Political Consultant
Consultor Político

ELEANOR M. DAVIS
Hi-Tech Business Woman
Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico

NOTE
29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

(Contest Continued on Next Page)
(Continua en la siguiente pagina)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>DAVID L. KILBER</td>
<td>Management Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>QUENTIN L. KOPP</td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>SUZANNE ALBERTO</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>LOUISE RENNE</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>JOHN L. MOLINARI</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>ANDREW “DADDY ANDY” JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**

29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>Community Services Director / Director de Servicios Comunitarios</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator / Conductor de Camiones 貨車司機</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Parent and Teacher Maestra y Madre de Familia 家長和教師</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant / Financial Consultant / Contador Público / Consultor Financiero 持證公共會計師／財政顧問</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant / Consultor 顧問</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>Incumbent En el Cargo</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education / Miembro, Junta de Educación 教育委員</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway / Supervisor, Tranvías Municipales 市營公共車監督</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMMUNIDAD</strong> 社區大學董事</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN  Incumbent En el Cargo  現任社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG  Incumbent En el Cargo  現任社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED  Incumbent En el Cargo  現任社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA  Incumbent En el Cargo  現任社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN  Teacher/Actor Maestro/Actor  教師／演員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD  County Central Committeeman Miembro del Comité Central del Condado  縣中央委員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU  Civil Servant Funcionario  公務員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ  Professor Profesor  教授</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTRITO BART 9</strong> 灣區捷運系統董事 (第九區)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARON A. VIEIRA  Computer Technician Técnico en Computadoras  電腦技術員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODNEY JOHNSON  Attorney Abogado  律師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. KIRKWOOD  BART Director Director de BART  灣區捷運系統董事</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Clean Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
<td><strong>YES 184</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 185</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td><strong>YES 187</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 188</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance Cleanup Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
<td><strong>YES 190</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 191</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>California Safe Drinking Water Bond Law of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
<td><strong>YES 193</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 194</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td><strong>YES 196</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 197</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Senior Center Bond Act of 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
<td><strong>YES 199</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Property Taxation. Fire Protection Systems Exclusion. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td><strong>YES 203</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 204</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Supreme Court. Transfer of Causes. Review of Decisions. Modifies existing constitutional provisions regarding transfer of causes and review of decisions. Fiscal Impact: No significant effect.</td>
<td><strong>YES 206</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>NO 207</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Texto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMpra-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoría de las escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar del medio las substancias peligrosas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTEABLE SALUBRE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejora de los sistemas de agua domésticos para compilar con las normas mínimas de agua potable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $650,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>FUICIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE LLOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCION CONTRA INCENDIOS. Otorga poder a la Legislatura para excluir del recaudo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejorías recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser llevada a cabo, pérdidas en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de $5 millones anuales, además aumentos en los gastos del gobierno estatal para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida en impuestos a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en los ingresos a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>CORTE SUPREMA. TRANSFERencia DE CAUSAS. REVISION DE DECISIONES. Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigencia en cuanto al traspaso de causas y revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningun efecto significativo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Property Tax Postponement. Disabled Person

**Proposition 33**

Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

| YES | 210 |
| NO  | 211 |

### Property Taxation. Historic Structure Exclusion

**Proposition 34**

Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

| YES | 214 |
| NO  | 215 |

### Taxation

**Proposition 36**

Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

| YES | 223 |
| NO  | 224 |

### State Lottery

**Proposition 37**

Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

| YES | 228 |
| NO  | 229 |

### Voting Materials. English Only

**Proposition 38**

Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.

| YES | 232 |
| NO  | 233 |
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por su dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales los cuales serían recuperados, con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ES-TRUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Excluye del recaudado del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos ejecutados en residencias que sean estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distintos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrarse. DISPONE que se reduzca el impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales, durante el primer periodo de dos años. Aumento en los costos estatales de hasta $150 millones durante el primer periodo de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsiguientes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2,6 mil millones netos, durante el primer periodo de dos años y de alrededor de $1,1 mil millones anualmente en años subsiguientes.

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede ser predicho con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública será de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: Jardín de Infantes al 12º grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador arroje a las oficinas federales a que enmienden la ley para que los materiales de votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.
### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, GENERAL ELECTION, NOVEMBER 6, 1984

#### REAPPORTIONMENT
Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

| YES 237 ↔ | NO 238 ↔ |

#### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS
Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate's personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

| YES 242 ↔ | NO 243 ↔ |

#### PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

| YES 247 ↔ | NO 248 ↔ |

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

#### A
Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

| YES 253 ↔ | NO 254 ↔ |

#### B
Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

| YES 256 ↔ | NO 257 ↔ |

#### C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

| YES 259 ↔ | NO 260 ↔ |
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCION GENERAL, 6 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1984

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos para 1986 y para las elecciones subsecuentes mediante nueva comisión compuesta de las autoridades del impacto fiscal. Costos de la comisión de hasta $3.5 millones antes de la elección de 1986. Costos de $10,000 a $20,000 cada uno para reubicar un director de oficinas legales en los distritos. Costos del condado alrededor de $500,000 para materiales para la elección de 1986. Ahorros para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1986 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPANÍAS. Limita a los contribuyentes y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos políticos efectivos. Iguala con fondos públicos limitados los gastos personales del candidato de oposición, impacto fiscal. Reduce los ingresos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente hasta $1,850,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite enmiendas legislativas. Impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos combinados del estado y condados comenzando el 1º de julio de 1986. El manejo de la redención y su impacto en los diferentes niveles del gobierno es imposible determinarse en este momento. Reducciones sustanciales bajos Programas específicos serían necesario desconocimiento de hasta grados en los que: los montos de gastos a bajos ingresos y por ingresos de impuestos reducidos que resulten de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentarían.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Pueto a emitir $42,500,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

¿Debe autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104,000,000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar el Departamento de Aguas?

¿Debe crear una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Publica?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>VOTO</td>
<td>PREGUNTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados de la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagarse un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que mueran como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el transcurso y período de empleo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá el periodo probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ocho y cuatro semanas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagarse un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que preste a los contribuyentes impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un exceso de gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>(Declaración de Norma): ¿Deberá ser la norma de San Francisco que ningún fondo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tienen intereses comerciales en Sudamérica hasta que sea abolida la segregación racial y se otorgue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudamérica?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

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

**Nota:** Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

**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."

**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 cubecitas 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 perfóre con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.**

**STEP 4**

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

**Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.**

**D 第三步**

副把帶釘之選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**E 第四步**

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預留為投票人應用。
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your address when you signed up to vote,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

BONDS—Contracts to borrow and repay money.

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
RODNEY JOHNSON
My age is 35
My occupation is a lawyer
My education and qualifications are: I am an attorney for Stanford University. Each day I help make decisions on financial matters, lawsuits, personnel issues, and policy for Stanford, which has an operating budget greater than $500 million. This involves matters ranging from running a hospital, to building 1000 units of new housing for faculty and staff. Additionally, I studied transportation while in college.

The BART representative should work for transportation solutions for San Francisco, and not just for BART. Can you find a seat on the bus? A parking place? I not only will work to manage BART more efficiently but also for San Francisco to obtain its fair share of money and consideration from federal, state, and local agencies in solving these problems.

I know the responsibilities of a public official. Elected to the 1978 Charter Commission, I served as its secretary and was appointed by Governor Brown to the regional Coastal Commission. I have worked to improve my neighborhood as a member of the Board of Directors of the Richmond District Neighborhood Center and the S.F. Local Development Corporation.

My endorsers include Assemblyman Art Agnos, former Police Chief Tom Cahill, Supervisors Britt, Silver, and Walker, and former Supervisors Lau and Morrison.

John H. Kirkwood
My age is 37
My occupation is BART Director/Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: 13 years experience in transit. Graduate: Lick-Wilmerding, Stanford University. Since my 1974 election to the BART Board, I have consistently pushed BART to improve and function more efficiently. BART has doubled the number of cars in service; increased access for handicapped people and bicyclists; increased on-time performance from 45% to 95%; stopped fare evasion; increased opportunities for minorities and women; kept per-mile costs down; given employees more flexible schedules; and drastically improved fire and safety procedures (BART has run 5 billion passenger miles without a single passenger fatality, the best record in the nation.)

I constantly review transit professional journals and the trade press. I spend countless hours analyzing budgets and operating plans to find errors and false assumptions. My ambition is to be the best possible BART Director, not to seek higher office. If you have questions, call me at 362-2939.

My supporters include:
Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
John Molinari, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
Agnes I. Chan, Former Charter Commissioner
Nancy Lenoir, President, Public Utilities Commission
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transportation Commissioner
Eugene Garfinkle, BART Director
Margaret Pryor, BART Director
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker, California Assembly

Aron Vieira
My age is 21
My occupation is Computer Technician
My education and qualifications are: As a founding member of The Community for Human Development in San Francisco, I am running for this office out of my deep concern for the Board's undemocratic policies and suspicious behavior. Although all of us in District 9 pay for BART few of us are informed about the decisions and operations of the BART Board. Meetings are not widely publicized. When was the last time you were informed about a BART meeting? In fact the BART Board exercises a monopoly over BART decision making by closing its doors to active citizen participation.

If elected, my first priority will be to Open Up the BART Board meetings to public scrutiny. All meetings will be held at times and places convenient to San Francisco voters.

Public Transportation should be by and for the people!

Humanize the BART!!

Rodney Johnson

John H. Kirkwood

Aron Vieira

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
Candidates for Supervisor

JOHN SALEH ABDULLA
My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Real Estate Salesman
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city's acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned of the these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials in solving these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

SUZANNE ALBERTO
My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispanic-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco's Charter permits supervisory inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:
Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononica, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabaro, 3609-18th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 497 Sloat St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ghanem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1302-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O'Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhya S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative
Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 755 O'Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:
L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoke St., Computer Analyst
David Carlson Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programmer/analyst
Rose Violet Descilo, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdra D. Dunlap, 125 DeMontfort Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez, Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garm, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glyn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Margery M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Koehler, 2007 Fols St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryenne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzales Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNeil, 251 Topoeka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemer, 125 Cantbon Dr., Retired-Produce Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fols St., Publishing
Petty Randell, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampora, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thompson, 111 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

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

ROGER BOSCHETTI
My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Roger Boschetti

RICHARD BRADLEY
My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartanist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spike Reagan’s anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

Richard Bradley

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 1958 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 631 O’Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonecrest Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1438-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2655 Chestnut St., Golden Gate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilen, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Rice, 1324 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Retain, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anza Vista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zyga, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-26th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikemani, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennys Stanford, 35 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student
Candidates for Supervisor

HARRY BRITT

My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I’ve worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
• I’ve supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sara Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinaro, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 43 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yoni Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant’s Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Dr., Senior Citizen’s Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women’s Political Caucus
Leon Bruschea, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Floyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Andrea Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Verano St., West Portal Avenue
Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER

My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portland-Free buses downtown.

We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni’s cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.

Please call 864–8641 if you’d like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.
If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Dornacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Pine St., Musician
F. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tancil, 1653 Washington St., Waitress
Raymundo E. Penn, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1390 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1159 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R., Parrinello, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burns, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 300 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malveaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
**CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR**

**JONATHAN BULKLEY**

My address is 147 Tenth Avenue  
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner  
My age is 54  
My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor's Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.  
My Architecture/Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.  
My priorities include:  
- Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.  
- Crime-free streets  
- Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.  
- Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.  
- Eliminating Bay pollution.  
- Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.  
The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!  

Jonathan Bulkley

**DIANA COLEMAN**

My address is 603 Kansas Street  
My occupation is Letter Carrier  
My age is 38  
My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!  
Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.  
Spike Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!  

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician  
Richard Bradley, 1 Ardsay Ct., Maintenance Building  
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner  
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker  
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper  
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver  
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator  
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker  
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker  
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary  
Jeff E. Higgins, 2430-28th Ave., Electrician  
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair  
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager  
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician  
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Foreman  
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker  
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker  
Steven A. Siegel, 414-26th St., Postal Worker  
Dennys Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse  
Alan R. Thomsons, 1841A Church St., Student

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:

Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board  
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner  
Ina Deerman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner  
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor  
Jose Luis Fernandez, 464-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA  
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board  
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association  
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor  
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner  
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer  
Ruth Gravanis, 74 Mizzah St., Glen Park Association  
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers  
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n  
Don Horany, 64 Kelso Ave., Former Supervisor  
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board  
Bill Kuhns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee  
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster  
Louis Hop Lee, 789-810th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner  
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House West; Member, Open Space Committee  
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.  
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner  
William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association  
Thomas R. Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.L.R.  
Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods  
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission  
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board  
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President of Mary’s Park Improvement Club

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

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor’s Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Bacci, 2478-23rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachael Balyeat, 2323 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Belmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1528 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Casano, 863 Carolina St., Artist
Toni Delacorte, 2023 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Deming St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 109-12th Ave., Attorney at Law
Adrian Belli Falk, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Fine Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 582 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Keating, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirtley, 1344 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kushner, 25 Presidio Ter., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Law, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 17 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rowell, 1319-5th Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Strauss, 1734-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debbie Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph’s Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary's College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:
Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d’Ottolice, 1356 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d’Ottolice, 1356 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Elaine M. Gilligan, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Ave., Banker
Marcia Kocel, 44 Mallorea Way, Bank Clerk
Bernice Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Lough, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Lough, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D. MacGiffrey, 2720-35th Ave., Banker
Michael J. McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McNamara, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Aileen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Pipps, 220 Prospect Ave., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1325 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour Whitelaw, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ain M. Willis, 1565 Dolores St., Housewife

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

ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM

My address is 1537 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.

I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.

Pathetic Wendy Nelder says “Fluoride causes AIDS”; degraded Willie Brown corrups us with “Oh What a Night” baccinalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.

San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche’s NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belch, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 557 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Geary Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farellones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative

RUBY T. JIMENEZ

My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican decent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Botinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Helton, 93 Premise St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ora Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blunkens Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conor Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I'm involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel parents resource center. I've been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as "Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Mayor Moscone). I'd like to dedicate my Supervisors campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hamric, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones are:
Stephen Harold Irvine, 2037 15th St., Carpenter
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Joseph A. DelCarlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Chairperson of MHD
David L. Butler, 895 Shotwell St., Salesman
Diane Moolanu, 43 Watchman Way, Graduate Student
David Levinson, MD, 2927 Folsom St., Physician
Helen Butler, 985 Shotwell St., Housewife
Joseph A. Macellari, 909 Shotwell St., Retired Cashier
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect
Rose Sillard, 10 Lucky St., Housewife
John Maras, 20-12th St., Student
Donald Strickland, 981 Shotwell St., Musician & Carpenter
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire St., Hiring Hall Director
Oscar Herrera, 360 Holyoke St., Educator
Delmar T. Burge, 142 Central Ave., Professional Musician
Rose Macellari, 909 Shotwell St., Housewife
Jesse S. Valencia, 751 Castro St., Job Developer
Peter Anthony Riviera, 57 Peters Ave., Councilor
Fernando Cosio, 177 Johnstone Dr., Executive Director
Miguel Quinon, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Social Worker
Harry W. Madison, 401 Folsom St., Appliance Repair
Paul Sussman, 1243 Third Ave., Housing Finance
Carmenita L. De la Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Kathryn M. McCamant, 625 Scott St., Tenant Organizer
Lynne Bostick, 2135-26th Ave., Grants Coordinator
Harry E. Baker, 1345 Clement St., Project Coordinator

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Bovice, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agripina R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa La., Union Official
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lira, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Maginn, 1 Nobb Hill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 60 Elise St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 164-6th Ave., Minister
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilmaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Candidates for Supervisor

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyes" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyes". Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.
God help us.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Daxley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator, Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmle, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McClammer St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moebes, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Rosser, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 375 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jesse St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER

My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.
I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.
San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fajno, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elora Hardy, 143 Farallon St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Perrillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Sunince, 2364-52nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozzit, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkrug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

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

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average of $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your “financial watchdog” in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzalez, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2060 O'Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Retired Publisher
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Golda Kaufman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schivo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Mardikian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Self Employed
Businesswoman
 Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Policeman Commissioner
 Dorothy Vukisch, 177 San Aseo Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
 Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29

My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center

As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks

You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 54 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arballo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1202 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobrowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 320 Monticello, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kelioch St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A 24th St., Service Manager
Richmond Loewinson, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Loret, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Berniece Martin, 506 Church St., Public Spenographer
Jonah McCurdy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Schechtman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1890 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 2530 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker

---

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

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan and former White House staffer (1977-78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:

- San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
- Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
- Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
- Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
- Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
- Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisors
- Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
- Co-author of three books
- Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
- Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women

- Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition J which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

The sponsors for Julianne Malveaux are:

Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
Judith Brecka, 609 Kansas St., Lawyer, City Commissioner
Randall Bronner, 1390 Market St., Artist/Musician
Rene Cazenave, 2821-22nd St., Housing Advocacy
Terence Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Thomas C. Fleming, 2171 O’Farrell St., Journalist
Terry A. Francoisi, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Margaret A. Gannon, 3649-16th St., Attorney
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Yvonne S. Golden, 1743-9th Ave., School Administrator
Peter M. Good, 709 Shadrer St., Arborist
Roberto Y. Hernandez, 852 Moultrie St., Director, Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave., Union Organizer
Doris W. Kahn, 329 Clay St., Transportation Commissioner
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Michael Koblentz, 825 Masonic Ave., Distributor
Orelia Langston, 55 Friendship Way, Senior and Geriatric Specialist
Arthur Lathan, 2350-48th Ave., Personnel Administrator
Michael C. Miller, 1920 Quint St., Attorney
Jack D. Morrison, 44 Woodland Ave., Management consultant
Carl Dio Roere, 2043-64th Ave., Graduate Student
Ruth Gordon Schnapp, 726-23rd Ave., Structural Engineer
Frances M. Shaskan, 259-32nd Ave., Consumer Rights Advocate
Anita Silvers, 15 Orange St., Professor, S.F. State
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Bruce M. StCyr, 343 Chester Ave., Vice President AFSCME Local 2620
Ida V. Strickland, 1664 Fulton St., Administrator
Calvin Welch, 519 Ashbury St., Community Consultant

JOHN L. MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49

My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.

For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:

- Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
- Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
- Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
- Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
- Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Ams C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Eliseus Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon I. Lau, 140 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 570 24th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Holtzclaw, 1908 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

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

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 500-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 186 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppinette, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 585 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane McCaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coleridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tish A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Potter, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marguerite Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephen H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:

Margaret Moskovitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 435-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Louie S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boscetti, 20 Carnelian St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 371-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 435-25th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Bari, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laurn B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyers, Jr, 2332 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pamela Wong, 1555 Shadrac St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Cobett Ave., Retired
Cari H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I. Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Kekstane, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife

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

LOUISE RENNE
My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implemented. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.
At the same time I played a leadership role in legislation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors and children).
My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney General, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases in Supreme Court; President, California Women Lawyers.
As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 39 RiVoli St., Public Relations
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 11 Lunado Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cauthill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President, Personnel
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 459-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F. Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Cir., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filibert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1209 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER
My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing attorney; mother of two.
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
My parking reform legislation will open up neighborhood parking spaces.
My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our whole City more safe.
—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnost, 2131 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Honig, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2590-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Dayoufot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teresa E. Griffin, 839-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 475-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1035 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Arthur/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor

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

DAVID C. SMITH
My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city's growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

KEVIN STARR
My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:
James Bailey, Sr., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapia Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgins, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Ardith Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGeehan, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McIlhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pong, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurateur
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:
Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Altschuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 256 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Biradelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restauranteur
Sam Camhi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caufield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Vyolet L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 665 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Hoadley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorrwin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipst, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorch, 1054 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Mankin, 2312 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #38
John N. Rosekranz, Jr., 2840 Broadway, Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salarz, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Stransky, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2930 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 652-6th Ave., Attorney

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

My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans.

I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation.

I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58

My qualifications for office are: My program:

Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrises replace workers’ residences.

Door-key children of working parents, denied child-care, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties.

Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:

Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Carolene W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader James E. Sandmire, 452 Buchanan St., Minister E. Patricia (Pat) Lucay, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher Walter W. Grumm, 3125-22nd St., Clergyperson Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retired Social Worker Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Aide Paul S. Yein, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator Fred L. Kurlander, 115 San Aleso, Attorney Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer Gary E. Myerscough, 156 Sprague Ln., Education Administrator Paula F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher Jerry G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant Shirley Kaiser, 806-53rd Ave., Teacher Robert W. Shore, 140 Guerrero St., Businessman Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd., Secretary Jennette Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palo Alto Ave., Small Business Owner William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Paralegal/Consultant Julita V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:

Alan A Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action Paul Colvin, 558-36th Ave., Printer Nancy G. Elnor, 615 Central Ave., Teacher Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor Millie B. Gonzalez, 2543-32nd Ave., Student Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk William G. Leumer, 535 Day St., Mechanic Ann Manessche, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney Linda I. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessie St., Machinist Karen A. Schieve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver Carole Seligman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver Kathryn Setian, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer Margery Jean VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Poster or Clerk David Walters, 2543-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

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

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It’s time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It’s time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Dembom, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 395 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 120-20th Ave., Architect
Alicia Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishhacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Keenue, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell I. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Launa E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-53rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Terr., Teacher

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

DICK CERBATOS
My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens’ Advisory and PTA committees focussing on education. As an engineer, business owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.

As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children’s problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.

I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.

I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatos

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Winnie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4405-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Baustista, 1535 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borovice, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Novan Estevan, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judy Dellamonica, 3523 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hengnessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas, E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President, ILGWU
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILGWU
Mrya G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ted Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSEN
My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.

For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.

I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.

I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

Chris Christenson

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:

Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1709-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, III, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Dela Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Liana Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Haver, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Lena M. Quintana, 3331 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Viceconte Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, R. Wilkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier

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

LIBBY DENEBEIM

My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member

My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.

I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.

There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.

Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:

Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2834 Green St., Community Leader
Carlotta T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Haisch, 4 Cortez St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 546-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarty, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinar, 50-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Rafal, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Ledaer
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 65 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yuri Wada, 563-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pansy Ponzi Walker, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Seacchiff Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.

I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.

Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:

Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Auray, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaola, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Tereese Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howard-Ison, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escondido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Mim Landry, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mizpah St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mess, M.D.S. Lundy's Ln., AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1332-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingeron Ave., Executive Director

CAHEED
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Sims., 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello St., Attorney
Michael Stepianian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillitas, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 1236-26th Ave., Editor

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

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant
My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Eng supports:
- Our children’s inherent right for education.
- Regain respect for our teachers.
- Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
- Higher standards for teachers and students.
- Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
- Merit pay to outstanding teachers.

Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.

Eng opposes:
- Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
- Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tau, 2 Denisow Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Belli, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Geilert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pausswang, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 475-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 663 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palmos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. Melfeeheu, 1539 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P.-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Petersville, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-38th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alioto, 2898 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., 44 Corett Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician
My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:
Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Castas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palmos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Der, 439-43th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfes, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbaum, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorneuy
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raye G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heather Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave, Asst Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lance E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor

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

My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy's Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: "We're going to the moon in ten years!" Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60's have given way to the "other-directedness" of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Karlo A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea J. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lecano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

JAMES LEGARE

My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:

1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz

2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for James Legare are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Karlo A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea J. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Lecano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Nick Pace, 130 Campbell Ave., Railroad Employee
Sandra Parks, 16 Garces St., Railroad Employee
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejo, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JO ANNE MILLER
My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher
My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM
My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst
My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:
Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sal Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fries, 830-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Great Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marilee Hearne, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Darо Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Cleve Jones, 3863-18th St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myn G. Koff, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mees, 3382 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Mereed Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castias Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Brit, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hom, 1 Villa Ter., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willy B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kroop, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Ario Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembleyman, 16th District

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERNST "CHUCK" AYALA

My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administrating Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain responsive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest "Chuck" Ayala are:
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Batsiale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot St., House Wife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatoolh, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Asst District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Riple St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lullich, 15 Florence St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1769 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman-Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Rosales, 340-A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thomata N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burl A. Toler, 581 Orizaba St., Educator/Policeman
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 535 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3200 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorzekis, 545 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN

My address is 111 Lunadothus Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Dennard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Fly, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grandval A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Moinian, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Lauret Newkirk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbi Malcolm M. Sparer, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilliris St., Minister
Hannibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolfred, 31 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PATRICK C. FITZGERALD
My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committeeeman, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: • Am married, father of three children and a homeowner • Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco • Elected San Francisco County Central Committeeeman (since 1970) • California State Central Committeeeman (since 1978) • Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferraro • Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee • Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program • Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O'Dowd • Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committeeeman • Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall • Successfully fought peripheral canal • Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

DEAN GOODMAN
My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64
My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator's concern for quality instruction, and a citizen's awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.
If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beatty St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 3410 Hyde St., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2982-28th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeeeman
Committeewoman
Clara Stein, 2330 Sloat Blvd., Cashier
Brian J. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Sue T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., State Central Committeeeman
Mildred K. Bird, 1702-17th Ave., Retired
Mary Ann Cowen, 134 Detroit St., Secretary
Charles T. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Retired
Emily H. Shimmon, 19 Middlefield St., Housewife
Thomas P. Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Displayman
Esther F. Ziott, 75 Middlefield St., Retired
Peter B. Pangas, 1923 San Jose Ave., Engineering Graduate
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Adriano Biagiotti, 131 Detroit St., Retired
A. Lee Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, City College Graduate
Kenneth J. Lukas, 215 Detroit St., Carpenter
Lloyd A. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
Louise E. Quain, 96 Staples St., Retired
William T. Bray, 207 San Bruno Ave., Grocer
Mary B. Kavanagh, 165-7th Ave., Homemaker
Lisa L. Klobovac, 135 San Felipe Way, County Central Committeeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
Jim Reilly, 2088 Jefferson St., Attorney
Arlo H. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballard, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I Balman, 5 Pergo Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kino Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Climent, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Laurn Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergan Kalb, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marine St., Attorney
Donald J. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1667 Page St., Business Representative
Allen Nomura, 177 Bocana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Astor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Trantham, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Sigrid Wurscmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zamze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDRE F. PEHARGOU
My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.

Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.

As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.

If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

JULIE TANG
My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.

I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Andre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulus, 59 Prague St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Bucchiotti, 553 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 487 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Banks St., Supervisor
Alies Crowere, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Flahavan, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigues, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Hartman, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Hartman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Paillette Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Kepinger, 3832 Fulton St., Concierge
Anna Konor, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtney Kovach, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Univ of Calif Regent
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicgo Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept
Amon C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrus St., Planning Commissioner
Agrapino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Bette W. Landis, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director

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

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the faculty and administration whose main responsibility is superior teaching for professional and occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing and challenging; therefore community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:

Lilian Alden, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Bustos, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Bustos, 49 Capp St., Student
Victoriano G. Bustos, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagana, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion P. Cespedes, 531 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 4186 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odellia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felisa P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1211-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Ponewash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher's Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board

My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:

Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sodonia Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Denebem, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Agrupino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave, School Board Member
Carlota T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilarius St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 420-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 3787-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Roselli, 549 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Miedeg, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

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

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

YES 253
NO 254

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$42,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>81,761,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$124,261,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco’s income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That’s the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City’s fishing fleet at Fisherman’s Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City’s future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy.

But, the port has not adapted to container cargo, and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves. We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman’s Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But . . . times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, 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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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fisherman’s Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman’s Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner’s Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!

Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don’t let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

The Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
North Beach Neighbors

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women’s Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks
and Recreation in Chinatown*

*for identification purposes only

Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wollinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

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

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER! VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray  Mabel Schine
Doris Thomas  Linda Dickens

J. E. Thomas  Faye Anderson
A. Brooks  Zuretti Goosby
Frankie Gillette  Stan Palomares-Criollos
Lois DeCayette  Jene Rita Alviar
Joel DeCayette  Ernest C. Ayala
Julie Anderson  Alan S. Wong
Althedra Carrie  Stan Moy
George Newkirk  Douglas S. Chan
Elouise Westbrook  Thomas Hsieh
Shirley Jones  Alicia Wang
Clifton Jeffers  Ben Tom
Joe Williams  Pius Lee
Carol Belle  Julie Tang
Benjamin James  Louis Hop Lee
Grandvel Jackson  Dennis Wong
Amos Brown  Melvin Dong Lee

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A**

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco's maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego.

These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco's competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America's Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

**ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A**

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman.
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic County Committeeman
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a "fast track", it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by "letter agreements" with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for a proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no long-term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn't even secured written "letter agreements" from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman's Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It's like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don't have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer those very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE-BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby order the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco's piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?  

YES 256  NO 257

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$104,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>169,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$273,260,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated annual debt service payments, which pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes along side I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There is now no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
PROPOSITION C

Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City's Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our

City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer's auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor's control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health pro-

grams in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a "yes" vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can't something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General's "major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc." Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of "a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance" as a cause for "ineffective management."

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Louise Renne

Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Doris Ward

Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

(Continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department's role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors' needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

Kathleen Lammers
Abraham Biderman
Jeanette Harris
Larry Bernardini, R.N.
Nancy Bougy, M.S.W.
David Lally, M.S.W.
Ollie Mae Black
Stephen Graham

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Department's services. As more and more block grants transfer health programs from the state and federal levels to local governments, the Department will become an increasingly important provider to women.

Proposition C gives women an opportunity to make their voices heard at the highest levels of the Health Department. And our voices must be heard if services are to be organized efficiently and responsively.

Golden Gate Nurses Association
San Francisco N.O.W.
B. J. Badertscher, R.N.M.S.
Ellen Wolfe, R.N.P.N.P.
Suzanne Harris, L.V.N., R.N.
Annie Borgenicht, L.V.N.
Shea Watkins, L.V.N.
Pamela Klein, R.P.T.
Catherine M. Coleman, R.N.
Ellen Shaffer
Conrad Aleksandrowski, L.V.N.
Carmen Melero, L.V.N.
Denise Hunt, M.S.N.
Christina Feltus, N.P.
Mary E. Foley, R.N.

Louise Ogden
Lorraine R. Wiles
Elaine Adamson, M.P.H.
Barbara Engmann, R.N.
Ann Gonski
Ellen Roberts
Katherine Lambert
Catherine J. Dodd, R.N.
Priscilla Alexander
Sharyn Satalisky
Gail Dolson, R.N.
Laura Campbell
Flora A. Hurley
Cherie V. James
Judith Kurtz

Aurora Garcia
Tracey Cosgrove
Sally Martin, C.C.S.W.
Alexis Gonzales
Velma V. Gaines
Lili T. Davis
Ruth O'Brien-McMullen, R.N.
Shelley Spiro, R.N.
Arlene Carden, R.N.
Robin Dushane
Laurie Carlson
Janet Veatch, R.N.
Barbara Burges, R.N.M.S.

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

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, nonprofit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.  
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society  
Robert Aaron, M.D.  
Robert Gross, M.D.  
Molly Coye, M.D.  
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.  
Maureen Katz, M.D.  
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.  
James Cole, M.D.  
John Good, M.D.  
Jeff Sandler, M.D.  
Judy Keeven, M.D.  
Robert Dickter, D.D.S.  
Jeffrey Draisin, M.D.  
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.  
Brad Evans, M.D.  
Lars Erickson, M.D.  
Randy Yanda, M.D.  
Stephen Collins, M.D.  
Lewis Pepper, M.D.  
Mark Smith, M.D.  
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club  
Sal Rosselli  
John Mehring  
Del Martin  
Donald Cataland  
Cleve Jones  
Randy Stallings  
Ron Huberman  
Richard Allman  
Jeff Jones  
Phyllis Lyon  
Debra Friedland  
Roberto Esteves

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz  
Rafael Cedillos  
Maria Degado  
Roberto Hernandez  
Joanna Devito-Larson  
Rosa Maria Clos  
Susan Houston  
Arnell Rodrigues  
P. Braveman, M.D.  
Alfredo Rodrigues  
Sonia Melata  
Joseph Tanner  
Edgar Quiroz  
Angel Couturera  
Roger Hernandez  
Tom Romero  
Raphael Tatijferro  
Juanita DelCarlo  
Juan Pifarre  
Rudolph Mathias  
Rolph Hurtado  
Alfredo Rivas  
Vilma Mondoza  
O. Bracker  
Ray Rivera  
Lorenzo Dill  
Yolanda Cameros  
Monica Asturias
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO’s opposition is understandable. He simply doesn’t want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC’s opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10–15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let’s clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C. Beatrice Patterson
Thomas Ambrogi
Fred Ross
Arlo Hale Smith
James O’Connor
Dian Blomquist
Dale Carlson
Thomas Moore
Pamela Duffy
Peter Hanson
Gerald Yoachum
Jack Morrison
D.J. Soviero
Mary Vail
Rosalind Wolf
Sally Osaki
Gordon Brownell
Linda Post
Jim Wachob
Terrance Farr
Steven Krefting
Ken McEldowney
JoAnne Miller
Sue Hestor
Maura Kealey
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Margaret O’Driscoll
Agar Jaicks
Nicerita Revelo
John Holtzclaw

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium
Myles Dixon
Mike Pincus
George Dykstra
David Smith, M.D.
Susan Ehrlich
Marin Waukazo
Patricia Franks
Jerome West
Debra Friedland
Sophie Wong
Kate Lambert

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

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Patti Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics. But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department's policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be ad-
dressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a “commission” to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City’s health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was “to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION.” (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be “protected from political influence as largely as possible . . . ” and “it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence.” Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a “seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure.” To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that “the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management.” Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board's reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administration structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a "crisis-to-crisis" basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco's health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city's health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote "No" on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city's highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital's AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city's health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a "strong mayor" type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Neider, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.
2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

 Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services. Hogwash. Just another layer of government.
With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?
What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let’s do it—“Now,” not later.
Vote NO on PROPOSITION C.

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.
Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department’s health commission.
For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.
The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer’s budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer’s Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.
Do not politicize San Francisco’s health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department;
Health Advisory Board; 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 §11.102 and §11.501 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.
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 (Continued on page 82)
PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?

YES 261
NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

The Text of Proposition D appears on page 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.

The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serves a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System's investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It's logical. That's why I recommend a "yes" vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

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

PROPOSITION D

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)

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

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. # _____

Telephone No. (required) ____________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________

Signature ____________________________________________
Surviving Spouse Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?  

YES 264
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a health care fund for active and retired employees. The City’s contribution to this fund equals the average amount contributed to health care funds for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for a least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County's share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman Legislative Committee, Retired Employees City & County of San Francisco Helen McAtee, Chairperson Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse's pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your “YES” vote on Proposition “E” on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let's extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

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

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in any way. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of members and retired persons of the parking authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund, or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972 shall be effective July 1, 1973 1985.
**Employee Death Benefits**

**PROPOSITION F**

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>267</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System, is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee’s estate or designated beneficiary.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “F”**

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial.”

---

*How Supervisors Voted on “F”*

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSITION F APPEARS ON PAGE 69.**
Employee Death Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let’s agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.
Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.
Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.
For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Proposition F would cover all other workers in the City Retirement System. Proposition F will afford some measure of protection to city workers killed in the performance of their duties.
Proposition F will provide to beneficiaries an additional full year salary to the half-year presently provided, for a total of 18 months.
This is a small amount for a life given in the service of our city. Vote YES on Proposition F.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.
Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.
Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member’s contributions to the system, plus six months’ salary.
Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Beneficiaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months’ salary.
The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City Charter.
Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.
Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.
Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

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

8.509 Retirement—Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.
A(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

(Continued on page 84)

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

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?

YES  270
NO   271

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it, extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller’s Statement on "G"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrolcars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This is probably the most important proposition on this Fall's ballot, a common sense measure. It deals with the Police Department, which has the ultimate responsibility for the protection of persons and property in our community. It increases the probationary period of police officers by one year. It is intended to ensure that the men and women who protect us are of the highest quality possible. Right now, police officers actually have only a four month probationary period. That's because they spend over 12 months probation in class and training, and only four months on the streets and on the job.

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

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

**PROPOSITION H**

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

**Analysis**

*by Ballot Simplification Committee*

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

**How Supervisors Voted on “H”**

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

**Controller’s Statement on “H”**

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”

**THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatchers, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatchers.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Casciato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City's parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty.

Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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 I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

YES 278
NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of “excessive military expenditures”, as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers' money for a handful of misguided individuals?
City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION I

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

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:
(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as "star-war" weapons); research, development, and production of chemical and biological warfare; military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations).
(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.
(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.
(d) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) average individual tax contribution;
(f) average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

Section 2. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco shall notify the President of the United States, the Vice-President, all members of the President's Cabinet, and all members of Congress: that it is the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on the Federal Government to ask all Federal taxpayers, at the time they report their federal taxes, whether they wish that any part of their tax contribution be used for excessive military expenditures. This policy shall also be published for the people of San Francisco in major city newspapers.

Section 3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall be responsible for the publication of an annual report citing the amount of all federal tax monies collected from San Francisco taxpayers. This annual report shall include the following amounts:
(a) total federal tax revenues contributed by all San Francisco taxpayers;
(b) portion of the revenues in 3(a) budgeted for any type of military expenditures;
(c) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for excessive military expenditures;
(d) portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;
(e) average individual tax contribution;
(f) average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizen's Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizen's Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned Peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.

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


PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283

NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments
Julianne Malveaux, Chair
Essie Mornen, Co-Chair
Henry Clark, Co-Chair
Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer

Hon. Sala Burton
Hon. Harry Britt
Hon. Doris Ward
Hon. Richard Hongisto
Hon. Nancy Walker
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Louis Hopp Lee
Kim Corsaro
Roberto Hernandez
Bruce St. Cyr
Tim Lennon
Beatrice Eisman
Joan Apodaca
Wardell Jackson
Susan Englander
Henry Der
Sue Hestor
Ida Strickland
Brady Paul
Daniel Moses
National Labor Relations
Board Union Local 20

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Economics
S.F. State University
Candidate for Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

Michael Dukakis
Governor, Massachusetts
Submitted by John Burke
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa.

They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure." (Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said "foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism." As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

I support Proposition J and encourage a statewide effort to remove pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J"

STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid "a crime against humanity"; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN-JLO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Rev. Cecil Williams
Dr. Thomas Ambrogi
Dr. Norman Leach
Rev. Glenda Hope
Rev. Jean Richardson
Rev. Robert Cromey
Rev. Stanley Stefancic
Rev. James Claitor
Rev. Pamela White
First Congregational Church
Rev. Kenneth Westray
Rev. Prelono Walker
Rev. Charles Lewis
Rev. Matthew Fong
Rev. Donald Stuart
Rev. Lloyd Wake

Lia Belli
Democratic Candidate,
State Senate

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning

*Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.*
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee

Todd Roust
Republican State Senate Nominee

Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman

Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS

Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

One Retirement Board “success” was the purchase of 10,000 shares of Citicorp for $3,473,320. The shares on 3/30/84 were worth $340,000 (90% loss).

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people there are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CISPES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J
Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for
Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples' Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral “Crime against humanity” of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance— which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on. . . . End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the “Bonds”) are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the “Enterprise”) which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents’ fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereafter canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not described by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 52 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

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

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

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word “YES” under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word “NO” under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters' pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61
traffic safety education;
(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;
(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;
(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and
(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation, as the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county upon 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.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than ten years' practice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician or surgeon requirement may be waived by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Harriet Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and to remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certified. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years; provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1933, 1934 and 1935, respectively, and the term of one member in 1936.

Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

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 June 3, 1980 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.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
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health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offal and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less that a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

"Retention allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the "workers' compensation laws of the State of California shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the re-
tirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

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

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

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

B (b) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection G (g) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection F (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection F (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection E (e) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within thirty 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five 65 years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred ($100) dollars per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

\(\text{E (e)}\) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in subsection \(\text{G (g)}\) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection \(\text{A (a)}\) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowance shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

\(\text{D (d)}\) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under \text{workers' workers' compensation laws of the State of California.}

\(\text{E (e)}\) If a member shall die, before his retirement, \text{regardless of cause:}

\(\text{(1)}\) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection \(\text{E (e)}\):

\(\text{A (A)}\) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his \text{the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.}

\(\text{B (B)}\) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

\(\text{(2)}\) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection \(\text{B (b)}\) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

\(\text{a (A)}\) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

\(\text{b (B)}\) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this subsection \(\text{E (e)}\), for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this subsection \(\text{E (e)}\), any allowance payable under this subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefit paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

\(\text{F (f)}\) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system.
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1 2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

G (g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and services rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore shall be required of the city and county.

H (h) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7-1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection G (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual account of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection H (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), subsection H (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be
made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision 5 (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date herof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

† (i) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection B (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said subsection B (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

† (j) No person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as a election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(6) (k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(7) (l) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (b), e (c), F (f) and † (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated con-

tributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, no shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit

If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(a) If no benefit is payable under Subsection B (b) of this section:

(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member’s estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member’s contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member’s estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse’s death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(1) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(2) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in this subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest. If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this section, any allowance payable under this subsection (b) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in subsection (a) of Section 8.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person's child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

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

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport police force shall be for one-year twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the day following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION H

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

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the Board of Supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patroinen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression "rates of compensation", as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation".

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in Subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean compensation "earnable" as used in Section 8.549.

The term "police officers or patroinen patrol officers" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission, may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in Subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid fireman firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as fireman firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefightert classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. "Average wage" as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefightert classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefightert shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefightert shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefightert in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation". Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation", as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and "compensation comparable" as used in section 8.549.

The term firemen "firefighters" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, fillermen, truckmen, or horsemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8.361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member's service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month's salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief's operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrolmen, patrol officers or firemen; firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods theretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereinafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975–76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuélva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

A 第一步
请将选票向自动机投票插

B 第二步

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第三步

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 perfóre con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第四步

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入包封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人使用。
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________________________
Address __________________________________________________________ Apt. # ______
Telephone No. (required) __________________________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes ☐ no ☐
Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): ________________________________
Second choice locations (if any) _______________________________________
Signature __________________________________________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

I hereby apply for an absent voter's ballot:
Por la presente, solicito una balota de votante ausente:
請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加上述所示之選舉。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINTED NAME:LETRA DE IMPRENTA:</th>
<th>DATE-FECHA: 日期</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE:FIRMA: 申請人簽名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENCE ADDRESS:RESIDENCIA DIRECCION: 住址:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Address]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please mail ballot to me at:
Por favor envíe la balota por correo:
請附郵票寄給本人下址

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY OR YOUR REQUEST WILL NOT BE HONORED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hereby apply for status as a Permanent Absentee Voter. In accordance with the requirements of Elections Code Section 1451.1, I claim the following as my reason for requesting Permanent Absentee Voter status:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Description of Handicap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requisitos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Description del Impedimento

| EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT |

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALLOT TYPE</th>
<th>GENERAL ELECTION</th>
<th>PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 3</td>
<td>5th Congressional District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Senate District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16th Assembly District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(BART)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2700's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods. Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible. This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.
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PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the 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 title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perforé la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinct y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

選民所選擇的任何競選候選人，要在選票上該候選人之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，要在選票上該候選人之所有候選人中，選擇你要投選的候選人打孔，但不要超過所選舉的候選人數。

選民要根據選舉的規定，選在非選舉候選人選民信封所提供的選舉空間上寫上下載候選人所要選區的職位和候選人的姓名。

選民須注意：選在選票上箭頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有書寫污點或破損者，選票即作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔了，郵遞或弄髒了，撕裂或燙了、弄髒了非選舉候選人的選民信封，應交換選票選區的監選員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
### President and Vice President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONIA JOHNSON</td>
<td>Peace &amp; Freedom</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. MONDALE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALDINE A. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BERGLAND</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RICHARDS</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN KENNEDY SALAMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS BINDERUP</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA BOXER</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD CREIGHTON</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Finance Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Especialista en Financiacion para Viviendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL</td>
<td>米參議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILTON MARKS, Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador Estatal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL KANGAS, Peace &amp; Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizador Socialista</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIA BELLIL, Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Negotiator/Conservationist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negociador de Comercio/Aboga Por La Conservación</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK PICKENS, Libertarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propietario de Pequenos Negocios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>州衆議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR., Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orador, Asamblea de California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEE S. DOLSON, Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestro de Universidad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: 29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, Board of Supervisors</th>
<th>市参議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES</strong></td>
<td><strong>請選最多六人</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City and County of San Francisco 市及縣</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por no más de 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY 市及縣</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for No More than Six</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAVE WHARTON</strong></td>
<td>Community Service Attorney / Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAT NORMAN</strong></td>
<td>Health Administrator / Administrador de Servicios de Salud</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</strong></td>
<td>Political Consultant / Consultor Político</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEANOR M. DAVIS</strong></td>
<td>Hi-Tech Business Woman / Mujer de Negocios / Campo Tecnológico</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAVID L. KILBER</strong></td>
<td>Management Consultant / Consultor Administrativo</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLIE B. KENNEDY</strong></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</strong></td>
<td>Musician / Musico / 音樂家</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUENTIN L. KOPP</strong></td>
<td>Attorney / Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOHN SALEH ABDULLA</strong></td>
<td>Real Estate Salesman / Vendedor de Bienes y Razes</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUZANNE ALBERTO</strong></td>
<td>Administrative Secretary / Secretaria Administrativa</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOUISE RENNE</strong></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIAN LAGOS</strong></td>
<td>Political Scientist / Educator / Especialista en Ciencias Políticas / Educador</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIANNE MALVEAUX</strong></td>
<td>Economics Professor / Writer / Profesor de Economía / Escritor</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOHN L. MOLINARI</strong></td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors / Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPORTANT:**
There are two (2) pages of candidates for Supervisor.
(29 candidates, vote for 6)

**NOTE**
29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.

(Contest Continued on Next Page)
(Continua en la siguiente pagina)
### Member, Board of Supervisors (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES</td>
<td>Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS</td>
<td>Executor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>RUBY T. JIMENEZ</td>
<td>Directory Sales Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>ANDREW “DADDY ANDY” JONES</td>
<td>SFCC Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>HARRY BRITT</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Socialist Union Militant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>RANDALL BRONNER</td>
<td>Artist, Musician (Artista / Músico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>JONATHAN BULKLEY</td>
<td>Architect / Neighborhood Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>ROGER BOSCHETTI</td>
<td>T.V. Ethnic Producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>KEVIN STARR</td>
<td>Businessman, Communicator, Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>CAROL RUTH SILVER</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>DAVID C. SMITH</td>
<td>Administrator, Service Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>JOHN E. WAHL</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>SYLVIA WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Writer, Socialist Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**

29 candidates are listed on pages 3 & 4. Vote for no more than 6 of the 29 candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Parent and Teacher</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN ENG</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE S. HOPP</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICK CERBATOS</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON</td>
<td>Supervisor, Muni Railway</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBBY DENEBEIM</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE DYKSTRA</td>
<td>Community Services Director</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM LEGARE</td>
<td>Motor Truck Operator</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Community College Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST &quot;CHUCK&quot; AYALA</td>
<td>158 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, Board of Directors, BART District 9</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARON A. VIEIRA</td>
<td>177 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Technician</td>
<td>Tecnico en Computadoras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>160 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Actor</td>
<td>Maestro/Actor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>162 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Central Committeeman</td>
<td>Miembro del Comité Central del Condado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>164 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>Funcionario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>166 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Profesor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>168 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>170 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>172 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTrito BART 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Directors, BART District 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARON A. VIEIRA</td>
<td>177 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Technician</td>
<td>Tecnico en Computadoras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RODNEY JOHNSON</td>
<td>179 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Abogado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. KIRKWOOD</td>
<td>181 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Director</td>
<td>Director de BART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMUNIDAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEAN GOODMAN</td>
<td>160 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Actor</td>
<td>Maestro/Actor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>162 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Central Committeeman</td>
<td>Miembro del Comité Central del Condado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE F. PEHARGOU</td>
<td>164 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>Funcionario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOY VELASQUEZ</td>
<td>166 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Profesor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMOS C. BROWN</td>
<td>168 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>170 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIM WOLFRED</td>
<td>172 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, JUNTA DIRECTIVA, DISTrito BART 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Directors, BART District 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARON A. VIEIRA</td>
<td>177 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Technician</td>
<td>Tecnico en Computadoras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RODNEY JOHNSON</td>
<td>179 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Abogado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. KIRKWOOD</td>
<td>181 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Director</td>
<td>Director de BART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, JUNTA DEL COLEGIO DE LA COMUNIDAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>社區大學董事</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $325,000,000 to provide funds for water pollution control, water conservation, and water reclamation projects and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td>HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUP BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of $100,000,000 to provide funds for hazardous substance cleanup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $75,000,000 to provide funds for improvement of domestic water systems to meet minimum drinking water standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $650,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>SENIOR CENTER BOND ACT OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of $50,000,000 to provide funds for senior centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>PROPERTY TAXATION, FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS EXCLUSION. Empowers Legislature to exclude from property tax reassessment certain newly constructed fire protection improvements. Fiscal Impact: If implemented, estimated local government property tax revenue losses of less than $5 million annually, state government increases in costs to compensate for local school district property tax loss, and state government increases in income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td>SUPREME COURT, TRANSFER OF CAUSES. REVIEW OF DECISIONS. Modifies existing constitutional provisions regarding transfer of causes and review of decisions. Fiscal Impact: No significant effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Medidas sometidas al voto do los votantes proposiciones estatales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Notas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA LIMPIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $325,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para el control de la contaminación del agua, conservación del agua y para proyectos y actividades de recuperación del agua.</td>
<td>一九八四年清潔用水公債法案。本法案規定發行公債三億二千五百萬元（$325,000,000），提供資金，用作控制水污染、保護水源和洪水回水工程。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar el desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoría de las escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>一九八四年州校舍租購公債法案。本法案規定發行公債四億五千萬元（$450,000,000），提供資金用作興建或改善公立學校。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA LIMPIEZA DE SUBSTANCIAS PELIGROSAS. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para limpiar del medio las substancias peligrosas.</td>
<td>清理危險物質公債法案，本法案規定發行公債一億元（$100,000,000），提供資金用作清理危險物質。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEY DE BONOS PARA AGUA POTABLE SALUBRE DE CALIFORNIA DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $75,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la mejora de los sistemas de agua domésticos para cumplir con las normas mínimas de agua potable.</td>
<td>一九八四年加州安全飲水公債法案。本法案規定發行公債七千五百萬元（$75,000,000），提供資金用作改良家庭用水系統，以符合最低限度的飲水標準。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VETERANOS DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $560,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
<td>一九八四年退役軍人公債法案。本法案規定發行公債五億六千萬元（$560,000,000），提供資金用作援助加州退役軍人購買農場和農舍。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA CENTROS PARA PERSONAS DE EDAD MAYOR DE 1984. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos de $50,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para centros para personas de edad mayor.</td>
<td>一九八四年長者中心公債法案。本法案規定發行公債五億元（$50,000,000），提供資金，用作興建者中心。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>FUICIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD, EXCLUSIÓN DE LOS SISTEMAS DE PROTECCIÓN CONTRA INCENDIOS. Ofrece poder a la Legislatura para excluir del recaudo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas mejoras recientemente construidas para protección contra incendios. Impacto fiscal: De ser llevada a cabo, pérdidas en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad para los gobiernos locales calculadas en menos de $5 millones anuales, además aumentos en los gastos del gobierno estatal para compensar a los gastos esenciales locales por la pérdida en ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad, y aumentos para el gobierno estatal en los ingresos provenientes del impuesto a la renta debido a menores deducciones en los impuestos a la propiedad.</td>
<td>物業稅、消防系統規定，授權州議會豁免某些新增的消防改進項目免於物業稅稅負，財政影響：該提案如獲通過，地方政府財政減少物業稅收入估計每年不超過五百萬元；州政府將增加开支，這些增加是用於補償地方財政的稅負損失；因物業稅的扣除額減少了，州政府所得稅收入會增加。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>CORTE SUPrema. TRANSFerencia DE CAUSAS. RE-VISIÓN DE DECISIONES. Modifica las disposiciones constitucionales en vigencia en cuanto al traspaso de causas y la revisión de decisiones. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto significativo.</td>
<td>最高法院。案件的轉移及判決的複審。修訂現有憲法中關於轉移案件及複審判決的條款，財政影響：沒有顯著影響。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT. DISABLED PERSON. Authorizes Legislature to postpone property tax payments on owner occupied principal residence by disabled person. Fiscal Impact: State expenditures estimated to be less than $2 million annually which would be recovered, with interest, when the homes are sold.

YES 210
NO 211

PROPERTY TAXATION. HISTORIC STRUCTURE EXCLUSION. Excludes from property tax reassessment certain new construction on owner occupied principal residence historic structures. Fiscal Impact: Local governments property tax revenue loss of less than $100,000 annually. State government expenditure of about 32% of this to compensate local school districts for property tax revenue losses.

YES 214
NO 215

35 (Proposition 35 has been withdrawn from the ballot)

TAXATION. Amends Proposition 13 adding restrictions on real property taxation, new tax measures, and charging fees. Provides specified tax refunds. Fiscal Impact: State revenues reduced at least $100 million, net, over first two-year period. State costs increased up to $750 million over first two-year period and by about $150 million annually in subsequent years to replace revenue losses to schools. Local agencies other than schools property tax and other revenue losses of about $2.8 billion, net, over first two-year period and of about $1.1 billion annually in subsequent years.

YES 223
NO 224

STATE LOTTERY. Establishes state-operated lottery. Revenue use: prizes, 50%; expenses, not more than 16%; public education, at least 34%. Fiscal Impact: Cannot be predicted with certainty. Estimated yield for public education would be about $500 million annually, with less the first two years. Estimated division: K-12, 80%; Community Colleges, 13%; California State University, 5%; University of California, 2%.

YES 228
NO 229

VOTING MATERIALS. ENGLISH ONLY. Requires Governor urge federal officials amend law so that voting materials be printed in English only. Fiscal Impact: Insignificant.

YES 232
NO 233
POSTERGACIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD. PERSONAS INHABILITADAS. Autoriza a la Legislatura a posponer los pagos del impuesto a la propiedad sobre una residencia principal ocupada por un dueño quien sea una persona inhabilitada. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales calculados en menos de $2 millones anuales los cuales serían recuperados, con intereses, cuando las residencias sean vendidas.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS A LA PROPIEDAD. EXCLUSIÓN DE ESTRUCTURA HISTÓRICA. Excluye del reavalúo del impuesto a la propiedad ciertas construcciones o trabajos nuevos efectuados en residencias que son estructuras históricas ocupadas por sus dueños como el principal lugar de residencia. Impacto fiscal: Pérdidas para los gobiernos locales en los ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad de menos de $100,000 anuales. Gastos gubernamentales estatales alrededor del 32% de esta suma para compensar a los distritos escolares locales por la pérdida de ingresos del impuesto a la propiedad.

La Proposición número 35 no será usada en esta elección.

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. Enmienda la Proposición 13 añadiendo restricciones en la fijación de impuestos a la propiedad inmueble, nuevas medidas de impuestos y honorarios a cobrar. Dispone reembolsos especificados de impuestos. Impacto fiscal: Reducción en los ingresos estatales en por lo menos $100 millones netos, durante el primer período de dos años. Aumento en los costos estatales de hasta $750 millones durante el primer período de dos años y en unos $150 millones anuales en años subsiguientes para reemplazar la pérdida de ingresos para las escuelas. Pérdidas para otras agencias locales, además de para las escuelas, del impuesto a la propiedad y otras pérdidas de ingresos de alrededor de $2.8 mil millones netos, durante el primer período de dos años y de alrededor de $1.1 mil millones anualmente en años subsiguientes.

LOTERÍA ESTATAL. Establece una lotería operada por el estado. Uso de los ingresos: premios, el 50%; gastos, no más del 16%; educación pública, por lo menos el 34%. Impacto fiscal: No puede prescindir con certeza. El rendimiento que se calcula para la educación pública será de alrededor de $500 millones anuales, siendo menor los dos primeros años. División que se calcula: jardín de infantes al 12avo grado, el 80%; universidades de la comunidad, el 13%; Universidad Estatal de California, el 5%; Universidad de California, el 2%.

MATERIALES DE VOTACIÓN. INGLÉS SOLAMENTE. Requiere que el Gobernador urja a los oficiales federales a que enmienden la ley para que los materiales para votación sean impresos en inglés solamente. Impacto fiscal: Insignificante.
### REAPPORTIONMENT

Provides reapportioning Senate, Assembly, Congressional, Equalization districts for 1986 and subsequent elections by new commission composed of former justices. Fiscal Impact: Commission costs of up to $3.5 million before 1986 election. Costs of $10,000 to $20,000 each to relocate an unknown number of district legislative offices. County costs of about $500,000 for 1986 election materials. County savings of about $300,000 in 1986 for printing costs, and $200,000 every two years thereafter. Future reapportionments will probably cost less than under existing law.

| 39 | YES 237 | NO 238 |

### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Limits contributors and contributions to elective state office candidates. Opposition candidate's personal expenditures matched by limited public funding. Fiscal Impact: Reduce state revenues by about $100,000 each fiscal year and increase state expenditures by approximately up to $1,650,000 each fiscal year.

| 40 | YES 242 | NO 243 |

### PUBLIC AID, MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Creates Public Assistance Commission. Limits benefit expenditures to national average plus 10%. Legislative amendments permitted. Fiscal Impact: Net effect would be combined state and county expenditure reduction beginning July 1, 1986. Size of reduction and impact at different levels of government impossible to determine. Substantial reductions under specified programs would be partially offset to an unknown extent by increased costs under other programs and reduced tax revenues resulting from reduced federal expenditures within the state. Likely, state expenditures would be reduced and county expenditures increased.

| 41 | YES 247 | NO 248 |

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

**A** Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

| YES 253 | NO 254 |

**B** Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

| YES 256 | NO 257 |

**C** Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

| YES 259 | NO 260 |
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REDISTRIBUCIÓN. Dispone redistribución para los distritos del Senado, Asamblea, Congreso y de la Junta de Revisión de Avalúos para 1986 y para las elecciones subsequentes mediante nueva comisión compuesta de antiguos jueces. Impacto fiscal: Costos de la comisión de hasta $3.5 millones antes de la elección de 1986. Ahorros para el condado alrededor de $300,000 en 1986 por costos de impresión y $200,000 cada dos años de allí en adelante. Las redistribuciones futuras probablemente costarán menos que bajo la ley actual.

CONTRIBUCIONES PARA COMPANÍAS. Limita a los contribuidores y las contribuciones a candidatos a cargos públicos electivos. Iguala con fondos públicos limitados a partidas obedeciendo la comisión de oposición. Impacto fiscal: Reduce los ingresos estatales en unos $100,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal y aumenta los gastos estatales en aproximadamente $1,650,000 cada año de ejercicio fiscal.

AYUDA PÚBLICA, PROGRAMAS DE ASISTENCIA MÉDICA. Crea Comisión de Asistencia Pública. Limita gastos de beneficio al promedio nacional más el 10%. Permite enmiendas legislativas, impacto fiscal: el efecto neto sería la reducción de los gastos contribuidos del estado y condados comenzando el 1º de julio de 1986. El tamaño de la reducción y su impacto en los diferentes gabinetes del gobierno se puede determinar en este momento. Reducciones subsecuentes bajo programas especificados serían parcialmente compensadas hasta un grado desconocido mediante el aumento de gastos de otros programas y por ingresos de impuestos de los contribuidos de gastos federales reducidos dentro del estado. Es factible que los gastos estatales serían reducidos y que los gastos de condados aumentaran.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión del Puerto a emitir $42.500.000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la construcción y mejoras de las instalaciones portuarias?

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Comisión de Servicios Públicos a emitir $104.000.000 en bonos de ingresos para financiar la adquisición y construcción de instalaciones para el Departamento de Agüas?

¿Deberá crearse una Comisión de Salud que consista de siete miembros nombrados por el Alcalde para dirigir y controlar los hospitales de la Ciudad y el Condado, y los demás servicios de salud del Condado, y para nombrar un Director de Salud Pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and Black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Jubilaciones a hacer inversiones de los fondos de jubilación como persona prudente en lugar de hacer inversiones de carácter legal para compañías de seguros?

264 SI 贊成
265 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Ciudad subvencionar al cónyuge sobreviviente de empleados activos o retirados en la misma manera que la Ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o retirados en el Sistema de Servicios de la Salud?

267 SI 贊成
268 NO 反對

¿Deberá pagarse un beneficio de doce meses de salario por fallecimiento a diversos oficiales y empleados que muere como resultado de lesiones físicas externas y violentas durante el tránsito y periodo de empleo?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

¿Deberá el período probatorio para oficiales de policía extenderse de un año a partir de su entrada a un año después de haber completado el entrenamiento pero sin exceder ochenta y cuatro semanas?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反對

¿Deberá pagar un salario adicional a los miembros del Departamento de Policía asignados a prestar servicio en todas las motocicletas de dos ruedas?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反對

(Ordenanza de Iniciativa): Deberá San Francisco solicitar al Gobierno Federal que proporcione a los contribuyentes de impuestos si desean que una parte de sus impuestos se use para un excesivo gasto militar y si desean que la Ciudad publique un informe anual sobre los impuestos federales recaudados en San Francisco y sobre la parte usada para propósitos militares excesivos y la parte usada para necesidades sociales?

283 SI 贊成
284 NO 反對

(Declaração de Norma): ¿Deberá la norma de San Francisco que ningún fijo de pensión administrado por la Ciudad sea invertido en empresas que tengan intereses comerciales en Sudáfrica hasta que se abolida la segregación racial y se abogue a la población de raza negra plenos derechos políticos y civiles en Sudáfrica?
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
If you make a mistake, return your card and get another.

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

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
請雙手將票向自動機全數張選票插入。

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.

D 第二步
請確認票持插入時，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.

D 第三步
請把選舉之選舉針，由票卡之直插而打孔投票。

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

D 第四步
投票選舉後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you registered to vote by October 9, 1984.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
• are a U.S. Citizen,
• are at least 18 years of age on election day,
• are a resident of California, and
• are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours you can check the box on the form saying that you “Decline to State.”

Q—If I have picked a party, can I vote for candidates of another political party?
A—At a general election, such as this one, you can vote for any candidate whose name appears on your ballot.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?
A—Only if you have moved.

Q—If I have been convicted of a felony, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this election?
A—President, Congress, State Legislature, Supervisors, B.A.R.T., College Governing Board and Board of Education.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes, the workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 6, 1984. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes. Writing on your sample ballot will aid you in voting and will eliminate long lines at the polls.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in”. If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The poll workers will have a list of eligible write-ins.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

Q—Is there any way to vote besides going to the polls on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there, or
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ handbook (see enclosed card).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• your address when you signed up to vote,
• the address where you want the ballot mailed,
• then sign your name, and also clearly print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You should mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as possible. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 6, 1984.
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WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you wish to vote by mail you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You can get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. Please refer to the insert card in the pamphlet.

VOTE BY MAIL—See Absentee Ballot, above.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

PROPOSITION—This means any issue that you vote on. If it deals with City & County government it will have a letter, such as Proposition A. If it deals with State government it will have a number, such as Proposition 1. State propositions are numbered 25 through 41 because in June the numbers were 16 through 24.

CHALLENGE—Officers at the polls can challenge a voter for various reasons, such as living in a different precinct from the one in which he or she is voting.

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE—This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Each initiative ordinance needs signatures from 7,334 qualified voters. An ordinance passed by the people cannot be changed again without another vote of the people, unless the initiative expressly gives the Board of Supervisors the power to change the law.

PETITION—A list of signatures of voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

BONDS—Contracts to borrow and repay money.

---

RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED VOTER

1. Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them.

2. If architectural barriers prevent a handicapped voter from entering the polling place then the voter will be allowed to vote a ballot on the sidewalk in front of the polling place (Section 14234, Elections Code).

3. A recent law allows the handicapped to apply as “Permanent Absentee Voters”. A permanent absentee voter will receive a ballot in the mail at all future elections. A permanent absentee application appears as part of the regular absentee application enclosed in this book.
RODNEY JOHNSON

My age is 35
My occupation is a lawyer
My education and qualifications are: I am an attorney for Stanford University. Each day I help make decisions on financial matters, lawsuits, personnel issues, and policy for Stanford, which has an operating budget greater than $500 million. This involves matters ranging from running a hospital, to building 1000 units of new housing for faculty and staff. Additionally, I studied transportation while in college.

The BART representative should work for transportation solutions for San Francisco, and not just for BART. Can you find a seat on the bus? A parking place? I not only will work to manage BART more efficiently but also for San Francisco to obtain its fair share of money and consideration from federal, state, and local agencies in solving these problems.

I know the responsibilities of a public official. Elected to the 1978 Charter Commission, I served as its secretary and was appointed by Governor Brown to the regional Coastal Commission. I have worked to improve my neighborhood as a member of the Board of Directors of the Richmond District Neighborhood Center and the S.F. Local Development Corporation.

My endorsers include Assemblyman Art Agnos, former Police Chief Tom Cahill, Supervisors Britt, Silver, and Walker, and former Supervisors Lau and Morrison.

_________________________
Rodney Johnson

JOHN H. KIRKWOOD

My age is 37
My occupation is BART Director/Incumbent
My education and qualifications are: 13 years experience in transit. Graduate: Lick-Wilmerding, Stanford University. Since my 1974 election to the BART Board, I have consistently pushed BART to improve and function more efficiently. BART has doubled the number of cars in service; increased access for handicapped people and bicyclists; increased on-time performance from 45% to 95%; stopped fare evasion; increased opportunities for minorities and women; kept per-mile costs down; given employees more flexible schedules; and drastically improved fire and safety procedures (BART has run 5 billion passenger miles without a single passenger fatality, the best record in the nation.)

I constantly review transit professional journals and the trade press. I spend countless hours analyzing budgets and operating plans to find errors and false assumptions. My ambition is to be the best possible BART Director, not to seek higher office. If you have questions, call me at 362-2939.

My supporters include:
Dianne Feinstein, Mayor
John Molinari, Supervisor
Louise Renne, Supervisor
Bill Maher, Supervisor
Agnes I. Chan, Former Charter Commissioner
Nancy Lenvin, President, Public Utilities Commission
Doris Kahn, Metropolitan Transportation Commissioner
Eugene Garfinkle, BART Director
Margaret Pryor, BART Director
Ario Smith, District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr., Speaker, California Assembly

_________________________
John H. Kirkwood

ARON VIEIRA

My age is 21
My occupation is Computer Technician
My education and qualifications are: As a founding member of The Community for Human Development in San Francisco, I am running for this office out of my deep concern for the Board's undemocratic policies and suspicious behavior. Although all of us in District 9 pay for BART few of us are informed about the decisions and operations of the BART Board.

Meetings are not widely publicized. When was the last time you were informed about a BART meeting? In fact the BART Board exercises a monopoly over BART decision making by closing its doors to active citizen participation.

If elected, my first priority will be to Open Up the BART Board meetings to public scrutiny. All meetings will be held at times and places convenient to San Francisco voters.

Public Transportation should be by and for the people!

Humanize the BART!!

_________________________
Aron Vieira

Statements printed on this page are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
These statements are printed at the expense of the candidates.
JOHN SALEH ABDULLA

My address is 2533 Folsom Street
My occupation is Licensed Réal Estate Salesman
My age is 30

My qualifications for office are: I graduated at a local public high school. I also attended private business schools. I am presently a licensed real estate salesman.

Knowing the city's acute housing and employment problems, I am deeply concerned about these problems and would like to be in a position to find solutions to these problems. While I have no immediate solutions; if elected, I promise the people of San Francisco that I will devote all of my time to finding solutions to these problems by utilizing all resources available to public officials to solve these problems.

John Saleh Abdulla

The sponsors for John Saleh Abdulla are:

Saleh M. Abdulla, 155 Clipper St., Janitor
Sam Bachman, 238 Eddy St., Janitor
Richard F. Bourdon, 165 Clipper St., Mover
Peter Bury, 555 Post St., Musician
Freddie Cononica, 1419 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Alfred Catalin, 1459 South Van Ness Ave., Retired
Bernard Fabrop, 3009-10th St., Deputy Clerk
Robert Fulgham, 487 Joost St., Business Representative
Saleh M. Ganem, 155 Clipper St., Maintenance
Stephen A. Halbe, 1202-23rd Ave., Musician
Jamal Jawad, 488 Ellis St., Business Owner
Zelma Ann Johnston, 575 O'Farrell St., Retired
Barbara D. Jones, 1421 South Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Alfred E. Kelly, 4610 Polk St., Retired Union Official
Yhya S. Mohamed, 640 Eddy St., Maintenance
Brian Charles Percy, 333 Hyde St., Payroll clerk
Charles Ridgell, 347 Lexington St., Business Representative, Janitors Union
James Roy Sellers, 575 O'Farrell St., Unemployed
Madeline Smith, 159 Clipper St., Housewife
E. Perry Winston, 2866 Harrison St., Architect

SUZANNE ALBERTO

My address is 25 Pinto Avenue
My occupation is Administrative Secretary
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I am a Hispano-Filipina (English/Spanish-speaking) administrative-secretarial San Francisco worker and Muni commuter and have been a resident voter since 1968.

I believe San Franciscans would be better served if suitable inquiry and evaluation preceded passage of locally needed and desired legislation and tax revenue expenditures to assure anticipated results. San Francisco's Charter permits supervisory inquiry into expenditures. I strongly support thoroughly researched legislation and tax revenue use to benefit the peoples of San Francisco.

All of my sponsors know me to be a capable, persistent fighter for principles and public benefit and believe I would be an excellent supervisor.

Suzanne Alberto

The sponsors for Suzanne Alberto are:

L. J. Alberto, 4156-25th St., Communication Technician
Alvin E. Bernstein, 6 Roanoake St., Computer Analyst
David Carlton Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Tape Librarian
Sarah M. Butler, 206 Faxon Ave., Programer/analyst
Rose Violet Descilo, 215 Niagara Ave., Retired Bookkeeper
Deirdra D. Dunlap, 125 DeMontoft Ave., Telecomm Specialist
R. L. Feather, 111 Inverness St., Secretary
Angel Fernandez Jr., 1419-11th Ave., Security Officer
David L. Forks, 26 Shields St., Janitor
Paul F. Garm, 2387-44th Ave., Security Guard
Joyce A. Glyn, 38 Serrano Dr., Legal Secretary
Merry M. Gray-Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Financial Administrator
Amy J. Kocher, 2006 Fell St., Office Manager
Cheryl Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Housewife
Cheryenne Landry, 427 Font Blvd., Welder
David Mattes, 725 Gonzalez Dr., Truck Driver
Ruth Mattes, 725 Gonzales Dr., Housewife
Ardis McCann, 1789 McCAllister St., Custodian
Dewey W. McNell, 251 Tospka Ave., Utility Engineer
Leon Medina, 1725 Church St., Retired-Laborer
Nathan Nemor, 125 Cambon Dr., Retired-Produce Buyer
Patricia J. Powell, 2006 Fell St., Publishing
Putty Randall, 366 Wilde St., Grocery Clerk
Roberto Sampera, 328 Staples Ave., Sr. Drafter
Clifford C. Schlink, 2256-18th Ave., Mechanic
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Clerical
E. L. Thomason, 11 Inverness St., Student
Kenneth E. Tucker, Jr., 243 Hahn St., Building and Grounds Patrolman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROGER BOSCHETTI
My address is 20 Carnelian Way
My occupation is Television Producer, Host, Writer, and Labor Consultant
My qualifications for office are: 25 years of involvement with working men, women, and young people, and as a concerned citizen, I will work to implement laws which will benefit all the people of San Francisco, such as reducing payroll and business tax, so as to encourage small businesses to come or stay in San Francisco, thereby creating more jobs. Will implement constructive changes in muni for speedier, safer and effective service, I will also create better programs to help the needs of our young men and women, I would like more police foot patrol, and more affordable housing, with more concern for our senior citizen

Richard Bradley
My address is 1 Ardath Court
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As a supporter of the Spartacist League I twice tore down the Confederate flag of slavery which flies no more in Civic Center. The American Civil War did not complete its historic mission. It will take a third American revolution, a socialist revolution, to liberate black people.

Spike Reagan’s anti-Soviet war plans and union-busting austerity drive by mass strike action! U.S. imperialism—hands off Central America! Smash Klan/Nazi terror through labor/black action! Break with Democrats—enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers party that will stop at nothing short of socialist revolution and a workers government!

The sponsors for Roger Boschetti are:
William A. Arietta, 16 Wheat St., Police Officer
Rita M. Belli, 1958 Greenwich St., Assessment Clerk
Rachel Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Cosmetologist
George Contessi-Turner, 631 O'Farrell St., Instructor/Professor
Bernard M. Crotty, 2971-23rd Ave., City Employee
John E. Downey, 83 Gaviota Way, Nationally Known Referee/Limo Driver/Boxing Judge
Curtis Elliott, 350 Glenview Dr., Doorman
Evelyn C. Fitzgerald, 230 Stonestreet Dr., School Administrator
Jack Goldberg, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Consultant
Robert Jacobs, 1438-38th Ave., Business Agent
Roger Micheli, 2655 Chestnut St., Golden Gate Disposal
Robert T. Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Lieutenant S.F.P.D. Retired
Shirley Robin Moore, 2120 Larkin St., Investigator
Marie G. Neilson, 319 Maynard St., Businesswoman
Marie Ann Perri, 80 Malta St., Corporate Secretary
Joseph J. Phillips, 1203 Clayton St., Attorney
John E. Ricci, 1324 Broadway, Lawyer
Don L. Rotan, 134 Gilbert St., Writer
Samuel Smith, 297 Allison St., Seaman Cook
Carmen Solis, 39 Majestic Ave., Restaurant Owner
Rose M. Tarantino, 160 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
John J. Vidal, Sr., 1437 Judah St., Office Manager
Winston Wong, 225 Anzavista Ave., Manager of American Cab Co.
Herman W. Young, 210 Brookdale Ave., Seaman
Maya Dhillon-Zygel, 455 Chenery St., Homemaker

The sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 80 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikegami, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Todd Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 4142-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennise Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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HARRY BRITT
My address is 783A Guerrero Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: As a full-time Supervisor, I've worked to see that every San Franciscan has a voice in making city government respond to our needs.
• I've supported crime-reducing neighborhood patrols to protect seniors;
• fought to repeal the sewer service charge;
• worked to protect the quality of our neighborhoods and environment;
• secured funding for anti-gay violence programs, AIDS prevention, community arts programs;
• sponsored protections for renters and small businesses from skyrocketing rents;
• worked to create affordable housing;
• sponsored equal pay for comparable jobs;
• worked to have downtown pay its share of taxes;
• worked to save jobs when companies moved from San Francisco.

Harry G. Britt

The sponsors for Harry G. Britt are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Sara Burton, 8 Slout Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., State Assemblyman
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Amos Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister, Community College Board Member
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Member, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Thea Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regents-University of California
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Businessman
Carole Mieden, 561-26th St., President, Harvey Milk Club
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., President, Alice B. Toklas Club
Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Newspaper Political Editor
Tom Murray, 4715 Balboa St., Newspaper Editor
Thomas F. Waddell, M.D. 141 Albion St., Athletic Games Organizer
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Affordable Housing/Tenant's Rights Worker
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arbello Dr., Senior Citizen's Advocate
John Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Sierra Club
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's Political Caucus
Leon Bruscher, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Howard Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Andrea Jepson, 1334 Masonic Ave., Nuclear Freeze Leader
Philip E. De Andrade, 601 Mississippi St., Small Business Owner
Georgianna Lynn, 165 El Verno St., West Portal Avenue Business Owner
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon St., Registered Nurse

RANDALL DWAYNE BRONNER
My address is 1390 Market Street
My occupation is artist-musician
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: San Francisco Budget Surplus-$162 Million.
• Muni Fare/Fast Pass Revenue-$46 Million.
Aspen, Colorado-Free buses ten years.
Portland-Free buses downtown.
We residents pay for more than two thirds of Muni's cost in our taxes. Residents should ride Muni for free!
You must check out the murals supporting Peace in Central America on Balmy Street.
Please call 864-8641 if you'd like to meet the survivors of 1906, free, at the Great Earthquake Exposition.
If you want to brighten up your street call San Francisco Street Gardeners for free cuttings, succulents, and flowers, at the same number.

Randall Bronner

The sponsors for Randall Bronner are:
Selig R. Raphael, 495-32nd Ave., Survivor 1906 Quake
Jane Domnacker, 9 Central Ave., Reporter
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
William T. Witter, 948 Haight St., Artist
James T. Lyon, 1761 Page St., Musician
F. Kelly Hartin, 119 Margaret Ave., Cateress
Julie Tandil, 1633 Washington St., Waiter
Raymundo E. Pena, 1470 Fulton St., Waiter
Mary L. Martinez, 295 Moscow St., Secretary
Sandra Renzi, 861 Post St., Waitress and Prep Work
Giorgio Irving, 1300 Market St., Waiter
Martin James, 1139 Broadway, Bartender
Elizabeth Kelly, 3249 Pierce St., Restaurant Services
Anthony R. Parnello, 312 Precita Ave., Artist
Carlos Gonzalez, 3409-20th St., Community Worker
Robert Burnside, 2548 Folsom St., Carpenter
Susan Cervantes, 398 Precita St., Artist
Ricky Bell, 2707 Folsom St., Student
James A. Lewis, 3030 Cabrillo St., Artist/Teacher
Julianne Malveaux, 26 Winfield St., Economist
Candidates for Supervisor

JONATHAN BULKLEY
My address is 147 Tenth Avenue
My occupation is Architect, Neighborhood Planner
My age is 54
My qualifications for office are: Experienced Architect and Planner. President, Planning Association for the Richmond; Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Member: Open Space Committee, Mayor’s Task Forces for Parking, Mechanical Amusement Devices and Sidewalk Displays.

My Architecture / Planning background will help me respond to the need for a coherent vision of San Francisco as a City that works for everyone.

My priorities include:
• Housing for those most in need—singles, working women, seniors.
• Crime-free streets
• Civil service preference for San Francisco residents.
• Caring solutions to seniors’ needs.
• Eliminating Bay pollution.
• Maintaining Neighborhood Character, Diversity, and Liveability.

The interests of San Francisco Residents will always come first!

Jonathan Bulkley

DIANA COLEMAN
My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I am a supporter of the Spartacists, the labor/socialists who put a stop to flying the Confederate flag, banner of KKK racism and slavery, in Civic Center. Finish the Civil War! Forward to a workers government!

Without socialist revolution catastrophe threatens mankind. We need an integrated workers party that will take the productive wealth from the capitalist bosses, and establish a workers government and socialist planned economy.

Spoke Reagan reaction through mass strikes! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Defend the USSR! No support to Democrats—liberal party of imperialism! Smash Taft-Hartley! Labor’s gotta play hardball to win!

Diana Coleman

The sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
Stephen Becker, 55 Wood St., Physician
Richard Bradley, 1 Ardath Ct., Maintenance Building
Dawn D. Cortland, 1416 Seventh Ave., Nurse Practitioner
Paul B. Costan, 127-30th St., Phone Worker
Jo Ann Davis, 96 Bertha Lane, Bookkeeper
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield, Cab Driver
David A. Ellison, 1135 Kirkham St., Sewage Plant Operator
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler St., Phone Worker
Lisa Gruber, 4540 California St., Office Worker
Margaret M. Grulich, 266B Carl St., Secretary
Jeff E. Higgins, 2450-28th Ave., Electrician
Kathy Ikeyama, 603 Kansas St., Telephone Installation/Repair
Alexander Larsen, 25 Harriet St., Building Manager
Nick Lopez, 120 Pierce St., Systems Technician
Tod Nolan, 225-14th St., Proofreader
Jane Pratt, 789 Sixth Ave., Office Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Gey Die St., Phone Worker
Steven A. Siegel, 414-26th St., Postal Worker
Dennyse Stanford, 55 Wood St., Registered Nurse
Alan R. Thomsen, 1841A Church St., Student

The sponsors for Jonathan Bulkley are:
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Tenant Representative, Rent Stabilization Board
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., S.F. Housing Commissioner
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Ter., Former City Planning Commissioner
Lee Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor; Former Supervisor
Jose Luis Fernandez, 404-43rd Ave., Businessman; Vice President, MAPA
Russell B. Flynn, 2610 Filbert St., President, Rent Stabilization Board
Ann Fogelberg, 2980 Vallejo St., Housewife; Vice Pres., Cow Hollow Association
Terry Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney; Former Supervisor
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Lawyer
Ruth Gravanis, 74 Mizpah St., Glen Park Association
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Port Commissioner; Past President, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
John Hooper, 201 Buena Vista East, Conservationist; President, Buena Vista Neighborhood Ass’n
Don Horany, 8 Kellogg Ave., Former Supervisor
John H. Kirkwood, 1635 Green St., Member, BART Board
Bill Kuhns, 4215-26th St., Co-Chair, Open Space Committee
Lim P. Lee, 1636 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner
Richard Livingston, 380 Eddy St., Administrator, Realty House West; Member, Open Space Committee
Peter McCrea, 1024 Lake St., Businessman; Past Pres., Public Utilities Comm.
Amy Meyer, 3627 Clement St., Rec. & Park Commissioner
William F. O’Keefe, Sr., 444 Corbett Ave., President, S.F. Taxpayers Association
Thomas R. Peretti, 3797-16th St., Banker; President, C.R.I.R.
Alan Raznick, 237 Topaz Way, Attorney; President, Coalition for S.F. Neighborhoods
Toby Rosenblatt, 3409 Pacific Ave., Businessman; Pres., City Planning Commission
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
Sam Valentino, 500 College Ave., Retired; Past President St. Mary’s Park Improvement Club

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

My address is 309 Lake Street
My occupation is Computer Accounting Services
My qualifications for office are: My experience with community groups and City Hall is extensive.

Involved in local politics through neighborhood and merchant associations, worked on campaigns for Diane Feinstein, and many others. Served the community through the following organizations: Vice President, Clement Merchants, head of legislative committee; Consultant to Polk Merchants; Member, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Roundtable, Vice Chair Health Committee; Board, California Alcohol Treatment Services; Chairperson Alcohol Awareness; Appointee, Mayor's Task Force on Sidewalk Vending, Parking; San Francisco Outlook, Project Manager; Member, SPUR; Boardmember Public Research Institute, SFSU.

A loyal devotee of San Francisco. I will serve honestly with an open mind and heart.

Eleanor M. Davis

The sponsors for Eleanor M. Davis are:

Ronald Atkinson, 2322-25th Ave., Teacher
Robert R. Bacci, 2478-23rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Rachel Blyeat, 2325 Hyde St., Investor
Luis A. Balmonte, 250 Walnut St., Real Estate Developer
Mildred Burrell, 2970 Pine St., General Contractor
Leslie A. Burton, 1528 Baker St., Attorney
Rose Cassano, 803 Carolina St., Artist
Toni Delacorte, 2025 Hayes St., Public Relations Executive
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Deming St., Registered Nurse
John Richard Doyle, 109-12th Ave., Attorney at Law
Adrian Bell Falk, 1000 Green St., Housewife
Rory A. Flood, 1070 Revere St., Owner, Fine Furniture Company
Patricia Hooper, 582 Arkansas St., Writer
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman and Library Commissioner
Paul Raynor Keating, 180-4th Ave., Attorney at Law
Dennis E. Kirley, 1344 Larkin St., Manager of Gift Shop
Beatrice Kushner, 35 Presidio Ter., Attorney at Law
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Ted R. Moulton, 17 Leroy Pl., Architect
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Owner, Data Processing Company
Kenneth E. Rowell, 1319-5th Ave., Engineer
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Liquor Store Owner and Chairman of Parking Authority
Robert L. Strauss, 1734-9th Ave., Graduate Student
Debbie Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner
Larry Weinberg, 3515 Clement St., Store Owner

EDWARD MICHAEL HAYES

My address is 695 John Muir Drive
My occupation is Banker
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Forty-four years after my grandparents were married here in San Francisco, just seven months after the nineteen hundred and six earthquake. A beautiful blond hair, blue-eyed baby boy came bouncing out of St. Joseph's Hospital. Studying economics at St. Mary's College after attending Riordan and then leaving religious life to create a conservation newspaper. Trying to educate local residents about the serious problems that we faced here in San Francisco and the bay area. If allowed to fulfill my dreams of what we can accomplish I will gladly give twenty-five per cent of my salary to charity.

Edward Michael Hayes

The sponsors for Edward Michael Hayes are:

Edwin B. Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Miriam Barry, 116 Virginia Ave., Retired
Agnes Cassidy, 385 Day St., Retired
Anna M. d'Ottillie, 156 Dolores St., Housewife
Bertram J. d'Ottillie, 1536 Dolores St., Retired
Mary M. Driscoll, 342-28th St., Administrative Assistant
John L. Flynn, 54 Seaview Terr., Banker
Eilene M. Gillilan, 133 Randall St., Banker
Rae Grubstick, 2479-40th Ave., Banker
Marcia Koeck, 44 Malloqua Way, Bank Clerk
Bernece Langley, 460 Duncan St., Retired
Bernadine K. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William G. Louch, 399 Duncan St., Grocer
William D MacGillivray, 2720-33rd Ave., Banker
Michael J. McCarthy, 3744-22nd St., Retired
Nora S. McNamara, 456 Duncan St., Retired
Ellen McSweeney, 457 Duncan St., Retired
Alleen P. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Mary C. Morris, 1557 Church St., Housewife
Leona P. Parker, 56 Harper St., Housewife
James L. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Clerk
Janet M. Phillips, 1467 Church St., Secretary
Rita M. Philipp, 230 Prospect Ave., Retired
Eugene F. Sullivan, 456 Duncan St., Ironworker
Catherine C. Tassone, 1795 Sanchez St., Clerk
Nellie Twomey, 1525 Church St., Home-maker
Seymour White, 3150 Clay St., Investment Broker
Ann M. Willis, 1365 Dolores St., Housewife

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

ROBERT DANIEL INGRAHAM
My address is 1637 Noriega Street
My occupation is Political Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Over one hundred years ago two great men, David Broderick and Edward Baker, gave their lives to save this Republic.
I ask you voters to compare these two San Franciscans with the small minded politicians of today.
Pathetic Wendy Nelder says “Fluoride causes AIDS”; degraded Willie Brown corrupts us with “Oh What a Night” bacchanalia; Feinstein lusts for higher office, and the rest are worse.
San Francisco can play an historic role in the development of the Pacific Basin. But you, our citizens, must decide. I urge you: Join with me and other candidates of Lyndon LaRouche’s NDPC in our fight.

Robert Daniel Ingraham

RUBY T. JIMENEZ
My address is 961 Delano Avenue
My occupation is Directory Sales Representative
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: A San Francisco resident since, 1948 and a naturalized American of Mexican decent, I consider myself an earnest interpreter of human needs for the Hispanic community and other minorities. Misinterpretations, injustices, lack of communication and mutual respect must be addressed and aired. These human needs for minorities and others can be solved if we end the current world depression. The humane world economic policies of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly his proposal for joint economic development between the United States and Ibero-America (Operation Juarez) can end this depression. The port of San Francisco should be expanded to become a strong world trade center.

Ruby T. Jimenez

The sponsors for Robert Ingraham are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweezy St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 2256 Potomac St., Millman
Holward M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Forklift Operator
Michael Frazio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elmon Hardy, 143 Fairmont St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1837 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-16th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Stannick, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozatit, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

The sponsors for Ruby T. Jimenez are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Stanley J. Bolinski, 1909 Eddy St., Staff Clerk
Willa W. Coleman, 215 Munich St., Sales Representative
Michael Frazio, 1824 Noriega St., Student
Patricia L. Hardy, 178 Broad St., Assistant Manager
Patricia Heiton, 93 Prentiss St., Teacher, Mission Community College
Andrea Konviser Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ora Lee Jones, 359 Orizaba Ave., Staff Clerk
David L. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
Ruth Matias, 638 Sawyer St., Office Clerk
Patricia McDonagh, 365-26th St., Housewife
Thomas McDonagh, 385-28th St., Construction
Ruth E. Rosenberg, 165 Parnassus Ave., Instructor
Leticia Wickersham, 171 Precita Ave.
Lupe D. Zamudio, 274 Broadway, Sales Representative

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ANDREW ("DADDY ANDY") JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Criminology Student
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I have been a respected citizen and server of San Francisco for 25 years. I’m involved in many community organizations that care for our community such as Glide church, Red Cross volunteers and the Singel parents resource center. I’ve been appointed to sit on the board of such organizations as “Mission Coalition, Mission Model Neighborhood and the Mission Education program, (appointed by Mayor Alioto and Mayor Moscone). I’d like to dedicate my Supervisor campaign to a few of the many people who helped me over the years, Chef Roy Hammerich, Betty Romenoff and the Mission Childcare Consortium.

Andrew Daddy Andy Jones

WILLIE B. KENNEDY

My address is 950 Duncan Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: In my three years as Supervisor, I have worked to maintain and improve the unique quality of life we have in San Francisco—from rent control to fighting for parks and open spaces. I honor our rich diversity of cultures and life styles through support of neighborhood preservation and the rights of all groups—from children to seniors.

I initiated a campaign to control the tragic increase in child abuse; and am working hard on the problem of decreased employment, particularly for youth.

I want to continue serving your interests in making this the most liveable city in the United States.

Willie B. Kennedy

The sponsors for Willie B. Kennedy are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2037 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Elected Official, Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Stati Blvd., Member of Congress
Leo McCarty, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-29th St., Member Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor/Airport Commissioner
Al Borvize, 234 Gates St., Attorney At Law
Harry G. Brit, 783-A Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman St., Member, Board of Education
Handy Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant, Commissioner PUC
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
James C. Hornel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Union Official
Gordon J. Law, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Aldo P. Lera, 1177 California St., Electrical Contractor
Cyril Magnin, 1 Nobhill St., Philanthropist
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
James McCray, Jr., 146-6th Ave., Minister
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Gina Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
Adolph Schuman, 1170 Sacramento St., Businessman
Stan Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillties St., Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES
My address is 121 Golden Gate Avenue
My occupation is Musician
My qualifications for office are: I am one of many in unity with San Francisco's diversity. I "Keyes" will open doors for you, to: homes, jobs, health care, better schools, provide more: complimentary fine arts, concerts, veterans benefits, senior services; close doors on pornography, drugs and prostitution; clean our streets and make them safe once more; eliminate wasteful spending and lower your taxes. For reasons like these, I am your "Keyes". Never again, will any San Franciscan go wanting, while "special interest" lick their fingers. Let us shine bright, the city that knows how, a guiding light to world peace now.

God help us. 

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:
Gary Gene Adams, 139-5th Ave., Plastic Fabricator
Wayne Austin, 391 Leavenworth St., Job Developer
Brian Chew, 334-30th Ave., Restaurant Worker
Ginger Coyote Coleman, 734 Bush St., Editor of Punk Globe
Hugh T. Dauley, 1177 California St., Computer Operator
Thomas A. Finney, 165 Turk St., Disabled/SSI
Howard M. Grayson, 160 Eddy St., Community Coordinator, Hosp. House
Louis J. Gwerder, 427 Valley St., Laborer
Mickey C. Helmel, 777 Tehama St., Patriot
John R. Hess, 554 Broadway St., Doorman
Kevin M. Kennedy, 250 McAllister St., Social Worker
Patricia E. Kerman, 1026 Montgomery St., Film Maker
John Lyman, 149-6th St., Musician
Patrick Marsh, 231-27th St., Chef
Perry V. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Teacher
Michelle Miller, 15 Surrey St., Student
David M. Moobs, 350 Frederick, Symphonic Musician
Keith F. Moog, 1233 Guerrero St., Controller
Gary Posner, 443 Broadway St., Engineer
Steven Present, 373 Ellis St., Security Officer
Clark Sullivan, 765 Ellis St., Political Activist
Tina Tatro, 646 Ellis St., Office/Clerical
Robin Vega, 1330 Jessie St., Courier
H. Joseph Wagner, 121 Goldengate Ave., Musician
James E. Washington, Jr. 55 Mason St., Consultant, Arts and Science
Guy West, 640 Polk St., Broadcasting
Linda Marie White, 777 Tehama St., Seamstress

DAVID L. KILBER
My address is 1901 Noriega Street
My occupation is Management Consultant
My age is 40
My qualifications for office are: I am a graduate of Oregon State University, a Vietnam Veteran, and a former candidate for California State Assembly. I have resided in the Sunset district with my wife Susan for five years.

I stand for a strong defense policy including the Beam Weapon anti-missile defense and the technology boom this new "Apollo" program will bring to the local economy.

San Francisco must become a center for science, classical culture, and trade, bringing blue-collar families and industry back to this city. We must expand the Port of San Francisco and launch the Pacific Basin development strategy proposed by economist Lyndon LaRouche.

David L. Kilber

The sponsors for David L. Kilber are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Holward M. Coleman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elnora Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kilber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayan, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozatia, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner
Edith Wasserkug, 2670-40th Ave., Retired
J.G. Wasserkug, 2670-40th Ave., Retailer

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

My address is 68 Country Club Drive
My occupation is Attorney/Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Local government is us, because we depend upon it to provide essential services and wise leadership. For 13 years I've fought to cut governmental waste and excessive taxation, to keep government honest and on its toes. My efforts have already saved taxpayers over $250,000,000 and I'm proud to be the one supervisor who watches how every dollar is spent. This year City government will spend an average $4,500,000 a day, every day. I want to continue my role as your "financial watchdog" in City Hall and add a needed balance to the Board. I would very much appreciate your support.

Quentin L. Kopp

The sponsors for Quentin Kopp are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Former Mayor
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Former Member of the Board of Supervisors
A. Marquez Bautista, 1535 Powell St., Attorney at Law
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor
Eleanor Rossi Cnabiree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businessperson
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
George Evankovich, 1600-A Greenwich St., Labor Representative
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney at Law
Jack E. Frankel, 72-22nd Ave., Rabbi
Merla Zellerbach Goerner, 225 Presidio Ter., Author/Journalist
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania Ave., Attorney at Law
Carleton Goodlett, 2060 O’Farrell St., Publisher
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author/Reviewer
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonercrest Dr., Contractor
Golda Kudman, 2900 Pacific Ave., Homemaker/Volunteer
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 3070-26th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Joseph P. Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
John Lo Schiavo, 2130 Fulton St., Priest/Educator
Haig G. Markarian, 2960 Divisadero St., Businessman
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired President of City Employees
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Harriet C. Salerno, 95 Drake St., Self Employed
Businesswoman
Burt A. Tobler, 381 Orizaba Ave., Educator/Police Commissioner
Dorothy Vukics, 177 San Aleso Ave., Housewife/Volunteer
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo Drive
My occupation is Political Scientist/Educator
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: impressive. A full decade of political activism at national, state, and local levels. Leadership roles in labor, housing, and education. To illustrate my seriousness in leading our City, I have launched the following initiative campaigns:
* A 3-year rent freeze
* Commercial rent control
* A balanced budget
* Expedition of labor disputes
* Driver-ownership of taxicabs
* An outdoor stadium in front of Moscone Center
As your supervisor, I will pursue:
* District elections for district councils
* Metro services for the Richmond, Marina, Bayview
* Higher police standards
* More schools and parks
You need me now, San Francisco! Who else you gonna call?

Julian O. Lagos

The sponsors for Julian Lagos are:
Charles Martin Adams, 34 4th St., Cab Driver
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 577 Arballo Dr., Psychologist
Elizabeth Alvarez, 1262 La Playa St., Sales
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall St., Computer Consultant
Elizabeth Benford, 508 Andover St., Attorney
Katherine Bobrowski, 417 Stockton St., Unemployed
Thomas J. Callan, 17 Sutro Heights Blvd, Consultant
James D. Cantor, 742 Treat Ave., Station Attendant
Henry Conserva, 1258 40th Ave., Professor
Leon Datangel, 725 Van Ness Ave., Businessman
Peggy L. Dickson, 520 Monticello, Student
Mark Emery, 555 Taylor St., Artist
James Michael Faye, 1369-B Page St., Tenant Advocate
Philomena Higgins, 146 Fillmore St., Videographer
Ken Johnson, 42 Kellogg St., Cabdriver
Vincent B. Latimer, 4118-A St., Service Manager
Richard Lowinson, 1341 Valencia St., Writer
John B. Lorette, 905 Columbus Ave., Cab Driver/Fisherman
Bernicie Martin, 506 Church St., Public Stenographer
Jonathan M. Murphy, 80 Alvarado St., Attorney
Victor E. Miller, 1341 Valencia St., Editor
Steven A. Schechterman, 1301 20th St., Attorney
William F. Taylor, 1900 Clay St., Operating Engineer
Frank S. Warner, 249 Fillmore St., Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 249 Cotter St., Legal Worker
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JULIANNE MALVEAUX

My address is 26 Winfield Street
My occupation is Economics Professor/Labor Specialist/Writer
My age is 30
My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan and former White House staffer (1977–78) Dr. Julianne Malveaux (pronounced “Mal-Voh”) is an elected California State Central Committee woman who is committed to a diverse San Francisco:
—San Francisco Tomorrow Board Member
—Booker T. Washington/Ella Hill Hutch Board Member
—Strong Supporter: Mondale-Ferraro
—Steering Committee, San Francisco Plan Initiative
—Delegate candidate for Jesse Jackson
—Former staff, President’s Council of Economic Advisers
—Ph.D. (Economics, MIT)
—Co-author of three books
—Columnist, San Francisco Sun Reporter
—Priority focus: job creation programs for youth, minorities, and women
—Author, 1984 Ballot Proposition 7 which prohibits San Francisco pension fund investments in South Africa.

JOHN L. MOLINARI

My address is 30 16th Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: To make San Francisco work takes both good ideas and cooperation with everyone.
For over 12 years as your Supervisor, my contribution has been to bring together both the diverse viewpoints of San Francisco’s many communities and the other Supervisors to solve our City’s problems. With your support, I’ve:
—Promoted the construction of more housing; limited condominium conversions to protect renters; protected tenants from rent gougers and outrageous security deposits;
—Initiated escort services to protect seniors;
—Initiated preferential parking and parking ticket amnesty programs;
—Protected our neighborhood character from big companies forcing out small merchants; and
—Protected San Francisco’s parks and playgrounds.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Slot Blvd., Member of Congress
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
John Francis Foran, 900 Rockdale Dr., State Senator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Louise K. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Homemaker/Media Producer
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunada Way, Pastor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Member, Public Utilities Commission
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Pastor
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director, Patient Advocacy
Gordon J. Lau, 540 19th Ave., Member, Port Commission
Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Duke J. Armstrong, 352 Divisadero St., Former President, C.R.I.R.
Paul Boneberg, 647-A Castro St., President, Stonewall Gay Political Club
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, Community United Against Violence
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter (B.A.R.)
Carole Migden, 561 28th St., Member, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Political Club
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington Way, President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Political Club
Maureen J. Conroy, 650 Eucalyptus Dr., Homemaker
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Chair, Sierra Club Bay Chapter
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, San Francisco National Women’s Political Caucus
Michael S. Salarino, 95 Crestlake Dr., Sunset District Merchant

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

My address is 319 Richland Avenue
My occupation is Senior Health Care Administrator
My qualifications for office are: I am a political progressive with extensive professional experience as an administrator, program consultant, mediator, and service provider. These skills and my perspective will be valuable additions to the Board.

My commitment to economic and social justice is backed by 25 years of community service to ethnic and cultural minorities, women, low- and moderate-income families, elders, youths, gay people, small businesses, workers, the disabled, and government policy-makers.

I support neighborhood preservation, affordable housing measures (including rent control), jobs and job training for San Franciscans, comparable worth, and environmental safeguards.

I am a parent and San Francisco homeowner.

Pat Norman

The sponsors for Pat Norman are:

Priscilla Alexander, 745 Haight St., Feminist Activist
Zohn F. Artman, 141 Albion St., Media Consultant
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Executive Director, SF Renaissance
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing Manager
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director, CUAV
Dennis M. Collins, 145-27th St., Political Consultant
Greg Day, 2260 Market St., Youth Services Director
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Attorney/Teacher
Walter R. Ems, 188 Eureka St., Retired
Lawrence V. Eppine, 765 Geneva Ave., Confidential Secretary
Roma Guy, 583 Missouri St., Co-Director, The Women's Foundation
Kenneth W. Jones, 600 Fillmore St., Office Manager; SF AIDS Foundation
Linda Jupiter, 2768-22nd St., Book Production Manager
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Senior Services Administration
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Editor
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Sandy Ouye Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Administrator
Jane Mc Kaske Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff's Department
Juanita Owens, 371 Coleridge St., Educator/Administrator
Tish A. Pearlman, 464 Duboce Ave., Writer/Photographer
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Political Activist
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor Union Business Representative
Marqueta Rubenstein, 46 Stillings Ave., Therapist
Stephan H. Walters, 1223 Diamond St., Fundraiser

JOSEPH JAMES PHILLIPS

My address is 1203 Clayton Street
My occupation is Executor (Probate Attorney)
My qualifications for office are: This is not New York. My grandfather worked for this city for thirty-six years; helping to make San Francisco the greatest place on earth in which to live. Now our city bus system has to go hat in hand to Los Angeles to borrow buses. The quality of care at our general hospital has come under extreme question. The city of love, tolerance, and understanding is becoming more and more divided by every hate on earth. I, as a fourth generation San Franciscan, call upon you to join with us natives in the fight to keep San Francisco San Francisco.

Joseph James Phillips

The Sponsors for Joseph J. Phillips are:

Margaret Moskowitz Berzin, 2201 Lake St., Retired
Ernest Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Amelia Sheehan, 458-27th Ave., Homemaker
Salvador Garza, 795 Brunswick St., Businessman
Gerald E. Gallagher, 2282-34th Ave., Retired
Jean M. McDermott, 325-9th Ave., Tax Preparer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Juanita G Cardinelli, 1215-18th St., Retired
Peter G. Economou, 2040 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Laura Lotti, 979 Avalon Ave., Volunteer for Handicapped
Leo S. Dolsen, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Consuelo G. MacDonald, 801-44th Ave., Retired
Roger Boschetti, 20 Carnelian St., Television Producer
Jody S. Hirota, 571-19th Ave., Dental Hygienist
Maurice C. Bihan, 111 Willard North St., Salesman
Kelly Lyon, 455-29th Ave., Secretary
Ralph A. Bars, 1236 Athens St., Retired Teamster
Laura B. Campbell, 1275-32nd Ave., NOW
William E. Beyers, Jr, 3232 Geary Blvd, Printer
Pearle Wong, 1555 Shadrack St., Housewife
Sophia E. Conley, 2845 Cabrillo St., Teacher
Jimmy Starr, 23 Boardman Pl., Lawyer
Hannah Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
John L. Santiago, 150 Woodland Ave., Retired
Walter J. Murphy, 767 Corbett Ave., Retired
Carl H. Hoppe, 100 Hamilton St., Retired
Jack I Berzin, 3830-19th Ave., Retired
Sam Reksteine, 84 Lopez Ave., Self Employed
Helen Marie Sheehan, 875-38th Ave., Housewife
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LOUISE RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My age is 47

My qualifications for office are: As Finance Committee
chairperson I have protected vital services while cutting
wasteful expenditures. Sound policies have been implement-
ed. San Francisco is on solid financial footing.

At the same time I played a leadership role in legis-
lation affecting the environment, health care, Muni, the
arts, indeed all San Franciscans (including our seniors
and children).

My prior experience includes Deputy Attorney Gen-
eral, Criminal and Environmental Units; argued cases
in Supreme Court; President, California Women Law-
yers.

As an effective Supervisor, I pledge to continue my
hard work, to act responsibly and compassionately, and
to speak honestly on the critical issues affecting all San
Franciscans.

Louise Renne

The sponsors for Louise Renne are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman 16th District
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli St., Public Relations
Ernest "Chuck" Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director—CYO—
Urban Development
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Pres. Airport
Commission
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Harry G. Britt, 783A Guerrero St., Member, Board of
Supervisors
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunadoe Way, Minister
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Thomas J. Cahill, 246-17th Ave., Chief of Police, Retired
Lilly Caneo, 5819 Jackson St., Housewife
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President,
Personnel
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Mattie J. Jackson, 523 Belvedere St., Vice President, ILGWU
Walker G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman/Commissioner
John S. Jennings, 2743 San Bruno Ave., Realtor (Ret.)
LeRoy King, 73 Zampa Lane, Regional Director of ILWU
Joseph Lacey, 601 Stockton St., Teacher
Leslie M. Lawrence, 2423 Broadway, Certified Public Accountant
Lous Hop Lee, 788-18th Ave., Civil Service Commissioner and
Attorney
Melvin D. Lee, 450-22nd Ave., Engineer (Commissioner, S.F.
Redevelopment Agency)
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Cyril Magnin, One Nob Hill Ctr., Philanthropist
Leo McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lieutenant Governor, State of
California
Louise Ogden, 1674 Filbert St., President, National Women's
Political Caucus of San Francisco
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Business Representative
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Investment Advisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, SF Board of Supervisors
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CAROL RUTH SILVER

My address is 68 Ramona Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: Experience: Seven years
a San Francisco Supervisor; twenty years a practicing
attorney; mother of two.
—Responsiveness to neighborhoods:
—My parking reform legislation will open up neighbor-
hood parking spaces.
—My fire and smoke detector legislation will make our
whole City more safe.
—Advocate for fairness legislation:
—preserving sunlight in parks
—outlawing gay discrimination
—creating low and moderate income housing
—repairing City streets and buildings
—rent control
—protecting Chinatown merchants
—S.A.F.E. and Senior Escort Programs
—Neighborhood Arts Programs
—reducing smog
—preserving San Francisco Bay
—expanding Muni
—wheelchair accessibility
—more women and minorities receiving City contracts
—child care
I will continue to insist on fairness.

Carol Ruth Silver

The Sponsors for Carol Ruth Silver are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Cyrl Magnin, 1 Nob Hill Circle, Philanthropist
Shila Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
George Agnos, 2151 Funston Ave., City Attorney
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., San Francisco Assemblyman
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 69 Elysie St., San Francisco Supervisor
Nancy G. Walker, 335 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., San Francisco Supervisor
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Community College Board
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, President, Airport Commission
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Utilities Commissioner
Emmett D. Condon, 2506-21st Ave.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Judy A. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Tim M. Daynonot, 645 Randolph St., Charity Media Specialist
Teressa E. Griffin, 859-41st Ave., Retired Teacher
Vivian Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Retired
Samuel Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Civil Engineer
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., Retired U.S. Postmaster
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Education
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Steamer Way, Attorney
Robert J. McCarthy, 354 Santa Clara Ave., Attorney
John B. Riche, 2 Presidio Ter., Realtor
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Business Representative
Jack Trujillo, 74 Ramona St., Word Processor
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DAVID C. SMITH
My address is 2567 Alemany Blvd
My occupation is Administrator, Service Agency
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: I am a San Francisco State graduate in journalism, married, with a deep affection for this place. For seven years my wife and I have counseled families and individuals from every neighborhood in San Francisco—an investment and commitment to the future. Dealing with these problems has increased my awareness of this city's growing preoccupation with rights and shrinking concern for responsibilities. The solution includes a return to basics, to strong family units, to solid values, to the worth of all human life. I will be a voice for those who feel excluded, especially exploited children and the disadvantaged.

David C. Smith

KEVIN STARR
My address is 445 Chestnut Street
My occupation is Businessman, Communicator, Professor
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are: Born in San Francisco, I relish the past, present and future of this great city. I know it from a variety of perspectives—as executive aide to Mayor Alioto, as City Librarian, as a newspaper columnist, as a professor, as a businessman, and as a person active in many civic causes. I now wish to bring my talents and experience to the Board of Supervisors. I believe I can be of unique service as the centrist advocate of this city as it looks to its future. That future, the well-being of each of us, will be my greatest concern.

Kevin Starr

The sponsors for David C. Smith are:
James Bailey, St., 422 Guerrero St., Minister
Lillian P. Bailey, 422 Guerrero St., Housewife
Janis Ann Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Secretary
Jeffrey Belt, 195 Sadowa St., Photographer
Robert R. Carlson, 337 Baden St., Radio Producer
Victoria A. Carlyle, 1808 Octavia St., Political Analyst
John William Castro, 3 Plymouth St., Mover
John Frederick Decker, 1090 Eddy St., Designer
Frances Edwards, 2554 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
Daisy Hepburn, 20 Tapias Dr., Homemaker
David Hepburn, 20 Tapias Dr., High School President
James W. Higgins, 1962-31st-Ave., Police Officer
Jean Higgins, 1962-31st Ave., Housewife
James L. Higgins, 270 Juanita Way, Pastor
Margaret M. Lee, 730-12th Ave., Secretary
Mark W. Lee, 881 Silver Ave., President, Simpson College
Arvid Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Norma Lindgren, 2565 Alemany Blvd., Secretary
Philip Litton, 3340 San Bruno Ave., Student
John A. McGeehan, 1230 LaPlaya St., Military, U.S. Army
Charles A. McIlhenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
J. Thad McKinney, 766 Kansas St., Station Manager
Marilyn G. Miller, 518 Dewey Blvd., Secretary
Chris Montgomery, 518 Dewey Blvd., Church Worker
Lawrence W. Pang, 254 Arch St., Environmental Health Inspector
James Douglas Robinson, 1319-7th Ave., Moving Company Manager
James W. Robinson, 518 Dewey Blvd., Executive Director of a Christian Service Organization
Conrad R. Sanchez, 1808 Octavia St., Restaurant
Constance B. Steinbach, 180 Lippard Ave., Homemaker

The sponsors for Kevin Starr are:
Richard B. Allen, 2111 Franklin St., Merchant
Lynn A. Altshuler, 1490 Sacramento St., Attorney
Thomas E. Anderson, 236 Moncada Way, Clergyman
Michael Bernick, 378 Goldengate Ave., Job Training Director
Gino Brindelli, 700 Columbus Ave., Restaurateur
Sam Cambi, 265 San Anselmo Ave., Insurance Estate Planner
Frank J. Caulfield, 1034 Chestnut St., Venture Capital Investor
Violet L. Chu, 1282 Vallejo St., Asian Art Commissioner
Elizabeth A. Cooley, 2820 Scott St., Legal Assistant
Paul Denning, 2165 California St., Investment Banker
Martin Eng, 665 Pine St., County Central Committee Member
James W. Haas, 163 Prospect Ave., Attorney
Patrick E. Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney
Walter E. Hoodley, 999 Green St., Economist
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Allan S. Johnson, 165 Prospect Ave., Consultant
Dorwin Buck Jones, 245 Northpoint St., Gerontologist; Director, Meals on Wheels
Harold K. Lipset, 2509 Pacific Ave., Private Investigator
Frances A. Lopez, 1474 Sacramento St., Paralegal
Paul F. Lorched, 1034 Guerrero St., Editor
John Maher, 795-8th Ave., Executive
Roxanne Mankin, 2312 Pacific Ave., Investment Real Estate
Michael Marston, 3375 Jackson St., Real Estate and Development Consultant
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Asst. Business Manager, Local #88
John N. Rosekrans, Jr, 2840 Broadway, Businessman, Toy Manufacturer
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlak Dr., Neighborhood Businessman
Michael Strumsky, 2266 Bay St., Construction Executive
Brooks Walker, Jr., 2305 Broadway, Business Executive
Suzan Yee, 632-6th Ave., Attorney

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

JOHN E. WAHL

My address is 118C Connecticut Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I have a 20 year record of voluntary, unpaid public service to San Francisco. I have worked with all levels of City government, with people in all parts of the City. Examples of my public service include being a Judge Pro Tem of the San Francisco Municipal Court, 9 years of service on the Board of the San Francisco Council of Churches, service on the Pride Foundation Board, and service to veterans. I am dedicated to ensuring affordable places to live, a responsible and unprejudiced police department, decent jobs, and dependable transportation. I am independent of special interest club politics.

John E. Wahl

SYLVIA WEINSTEIN

My address is 489 27th Street
My occupation is Staff-writer for Socialist Action newspaper
My age is 58
My qualifications for office are: My program: Courts, cops and strikebreaking injunctions; two-gate, two-tiered, union-busting tactics, are helping employers depress living standards. Escalating health, housing and food costs are forcing working people—especially Blacks and Latinos—out of San Francisco. Corporate condos and highrisers replace workers’ residences.

Door-key children of working parents, denied childcare, are left to roam the streets. Abortion clinics are under siege.

Only united labor—employed, unemployed, black, white—can change this condition. An independent labor party, based on the unions, must be built to replace the callous politicians of the two ruling capitalist parties. Jobs not war!

Sylvia Weinstein

The sponsors for John F. Wahl are:
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, Community College Board
Caroleen W. Marks, 55 Jordan Ave., Economist and Civic Leader
James E. Sandmire, 352 Buchanan St., Minister
E. Patricia (Pat) Lucey, 69 Huntington Dr., Attorney
Benjamin L. Marcus, 84 Winfield St., Rabbi and Chaplain
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Walter W. Grumm, 3126-22nd St., Clergyperson
Ann Marie Day, 136 Delmar St., Retirement Social Worker
Cleve Jones, 3363-19th St., Legislative Aide
Paul S. Yein, 342-8th Ave., Real Estate Agent
Hank Wilson, 1651 Market St., Hotel Operator
Fred L. Kurlander, 115 San Aleso, Attorney
Jean Wall Burgess, 421 Moraga Ave., Lawyer
Gary E. Myerscough, 136 Sproule Ln., Education Administrator
Paola F. Lichtenberg, 925 Jones St., Paralegal
Paul D. Hardman, 1782 Pacific Ave., Author, Retired Publisher
Jerry G. Guerra, 85 Fortuna St., Retailer
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr., M.D. 2170 Hayes St., Physician
Foster W. Weeks, 1910 Greenwich St., Advertising Consultant
Shirley Kaiser, 806-33rd Ave., Teacher
Robert W. Shore, 146 Guerrero St., Businessman
Rosa M. Kwong, 512 Van Ness Ave., Law Student
Charlene Yamato, 416 Font Blvd, Secretary
Jeanette Sibley, 75 Woodhaven Ct., Classroom Teacher
Alan Thompson Smith, 190 Palu Alto Ave., Small Business Owner
William Earl Andrews, 4130 Army St., Taxi Driver
Larry E. Hughes, 87 Fortuna St., Panlegal/Consultant
Julia V. DeChavez, 1591-45th Ave., Deputy County Clerk

The sponsors for Sylvia Weinstein are:
Alan A Benjamin, 2783-20th St., Editor, Socialist Action
Paul Colvin, 535-36th Ave., Printer
Nancy G. Elnor, 615 Central Ave., Teacher
Ralph P. Forsyth, 77 Cedro St., Teacher
May May Gong, 25 Bessie St., Power Plant Operator
Nancy L. Gruber, 921 Alvarado St., Editor
Millie B. Gonzalez, 2583-32nd Ave., Student
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Longshoreman
Ruth Harer, 149 Detroit St., Retired Office Worker
Donald Gary Harmon, 1297-18th St., Retail Clerk
William G. Leumer, 535 Day St., Mechanic
Ann Menasche, 2149-48th Ave., Feminist Attorney
Linda I. Ray, 3740-25th St., Registered Nurse
Ann A. Robertson, 535 Day St., Professor
Joseph M. Ryan, 25 Bessie St., Machinist
Karen A. Scheve, 3575-19th St., Sales Clerk
Michael William Schreiber, 3593 Mission St., Muni Driver
Carole Sellman, 245 Whitney St., Muni Bus Driver
Kathryn Selman, 1364-16th Ave., Engineer
Margery Jean VanDerslice, 1540-20th St., Registered Nurse
Christine Vaughn, 1255 Polk St., Pastor or Clerk
David Walters, 2583-32nd Ave., Power Plant Operator
Bonnie Weinstein, 1716 Revere Ave., Student
Deborah Weinstein, 1830 Church St., Unemployed Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 489-27th St., Painter

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

My address is 5031 Diamond Heights Blvd.
My occupation is Community Service Attorney
My age is 44


It's time for housing expansion, for transit, traffic, parking overhaul. Time for better City services, especially for seniors and youth. Time to strengthen economy, create jobs, control taxes. Time for neighborhood revitalization, parking relief. Time for human rights advancement, efficient and humane police services. Experiment with Board meetings in neighborhoods.

It's time for goals, results, citizen participation. San Francisco is world class city, small town; lose either, be neither. I build bridges, not barriers. Join our common sense coalition.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Libby Denebom, 200 St Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Douglas Chan, 596 Spruce St., Attorney/Rent Board Commissioner
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Russell Flynn, 2815 Pacific Ave., Real Estate/Rent Board Commissioner
Charles B. Renfrew, 791-14th Ave., Attorney/Former Federal Judge
Melvin M. Swig, 201 Locust St., Hotel/Real Estate Executive
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Alicia Wang, 1418 Leavenworth St., Educational Specialist
Mortimer Fleishhacker, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Investor
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel St., Consultant
Diane C. Kefauver, 1726 Great Highway, Consultant
Joseph Leone, 52 Exeter St., Union President/Retired
Jose Gomez, 59 Grandview Ave., Legal Services/Executive Director
Ronald Atkinson, 2322-26th Ave., Teacher
John L. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Insurance/Savings and Loan Chairman
Phyllis Kern, 306 Arbor St., Labor Union Secretary
Russell I. Kassman, 2454 Bush St., Businessman
Laura E. McBride, 925 Cole St., Typographer
George M. Raya, 90 Verna Ct., City Employee
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Development Executive
Gloria Armijio, 737 Pine St., Travel Agent
Lawrence A. Wilson, 333-A Pierce St., Attorney—Community Volunteer
Deborah R. Pines, 4248-20th St., Financial Consultant
John T. McAlister, Jr, 999 Green St., Businessman
Bobbie Griffith, 50 Leland Ave., District Attorney Investigator
Edith Wellin, 165-A Alpine Ter., Teacher

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD

DICK CERBATOS

My address is 471 Hoffman Avenue
My occupation is Member, Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have always been deeply interested in the education of youth. Before my appointment to the Board of Education two years ago, I served twenty years on Citizens' Advisory and PTA committees focussing on education. As an engineer business-owner, I also bring professional skills to the Board.
As a first generation American, I am sympathetic to minority children's problems, and aware that public education is the golden gateway to opportunity and success.
I intend to continue pressing for higher test scores, improved discipline and morale, less truancy, and an increase in college admissions.
I am committed to excellence in education.

A. Richard Cerbatos

The sponsors for Dick Cerbatos are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St., Speaker of the Assembly
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
A. Marquez Bautista, 1355 Powell St., Lawyer
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Barvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney at Law
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Diana Christensen, 56 Sanchez St., Executive Director
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval St., President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Bvd., Travel Agent
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Vice President-Personnel
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Eugene S. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Physician
Thomas E. Horn, 950 Rockdale Dr., Attorney
Ralph F. Hurtado, 65 Newburg St., Executive Director
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Labor-Vice President, ILGWU
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Reg. Dir. ILWU
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Bette Wallace Landis, 44 Entrance Ct., Volunteer
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Cir., Homemaker
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Yuri Wads, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, S.F. Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister
Timothy R. Wofred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

CHRISTOPHER CHRISTENSON

My address is 29 Oliver Street
My occupation is Transit Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I was born and raised in San Francisco, graduating from Balboa High.
For the past 7 years I have been active in the school district having been elected to 2 terms on the District Advisory Committee, 4 years as the chairperson of the Pelton Academic Middle School Parent's Group, and 5 years on the site advisory council at Pelton.
I am married and have 2 children attending Commodore Sloat Elementary School.
I believe there is much work needed to provide the quality education our children need to prepare them for a highly technical society of computers and robotics.

The sponsors for Christopher Christenson are:

Essie L. Webb, 186 Maddux Ave., Intake & Referral Specialist
Raymond Tunstall, 515 John Muir Dr., Deputy Sheriff
Francis Smyth, 1709-16th Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Harry E. Jensen, 74 Delmonte St., Electrical Transit Manager
Joe W. Turner, 1274 Palou Ave., Janitor Supervisor II
Martin Larkin, 4733 Lincoln Way, Paint Supervisor
James Grayson, 142 Lakeview Ave., Muni Supervisor II
Joseph Dels Rosa, 50 Oliver St., Seaman
Precious Moore, 2046 Thomas Ave., Home Health Aide
Liana Sand Dune Kastina, 524 Clipper St., Clerk Typist
William Satchell, 500 Francisco St., Transit Car Cleaner
Roy W. Hafer, 576 Lisbon St., Marble Shopman
Guadalupe Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Jeanne L. Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Grocery Clerk
Roosevelt Lancaster, 170 Ledyard St., Transit Car Cleaner
Leona M. Quintans, 3331 Hearst Ave., Housewife
Alfred Lent, 1475 Church St., Electrical Mechanic
George Williams, Sr., 335 Hearst Ave., Retired
Beatrice L. Dunbar, 430 Thornton Ave., Retired
Vicente Williams, 335 Hearst Ave., Driver
Gabriela, R. Willkerson, 1347-15th Ave., Cashier

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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LIBBY DENEBEIM
My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.
I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.
There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.
Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

The sponsors for Libby Denebeim are:
Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia F. Costello, 2836 Green St., Community Leader
Caro T. d'Ortore, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Gough, 298 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 183 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hungist, 110 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hale, 4 Cortes St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myra G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 340-14th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3852 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migdalen, 561-28th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Philip Bruce Rafal, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Roselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Ledaer
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 562-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pansy Ponzio Walker, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Scolliff Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA
My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary's Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent's Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.
I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student's right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.
Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

The sponsors for George Dykstra are:
Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Millicent E. Buxton, 80 Parisnus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D'Auray, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaola, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gaudreau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Terence Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Ison, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escondido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Kellner, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katharine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women's Services Consultant
Miranda Landry, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mipaz St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. McS, M.D.55 Lundy's Ln., AIDS Clinician-Researcher
Sussex A. Mok, 1332-38th Ave., Acupuncturist
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Inglenow Ave., Executive Director

CAHEED
Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Simms, 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parisnus Ave., Physician
Hiran E. Smith, 345 Monticello St., Attorney
Michael Stephanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. Q. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Millitary, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 1326-26th Ave., Editor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MARTIN ENG
My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant
My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.
Issues
Eng supports:
• Our children's inherent right for education.
• Regain respect for our teachers.
• Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
• Higher standards for teachers and students.
• Encourage teachers and parents' participation within the Board.
• Merit pay to outstanding teachers.
Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.
Eng opposes:
• Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
• Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1757 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsur, 2 Denison Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Bello, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 309B-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Patsalaw, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinar, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D., 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 663 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert F. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 336 Los Altos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McLennan, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Petersville, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Fond, 16-35th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alloto, 2898 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 444 Corett Ave., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.
My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician
My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The Sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:
Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alloto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elise St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodemia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 432 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burl A. Tyler, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nolder, 130 Casitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Dor, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfis, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbaum, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 44 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Erotla, 660 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Rary G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heather Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazolla, 3065-24th Ave., Asst Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor

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

My address is 200 St. Francis Blvd.
My occupation is Incumbent School Board Member
My qualifications for office are: Four years ago you elected me to the school board. I am deeply grateful.

I have worked hard. Student achievement scores improved, enrollment stabilized. We strengthened significantly special programs and alternative schools.

There remains much work to do. As a mother of six public school educated children, former teacher and experienced school board member, I know how our schools should work.

Many children today will finish school in the 21st Century. For all our children we must plan for the future, reaffirm our commitment to excellence, use school dollars prudently and ensure the momentum for improvement in our schools continues.

Libby Denebeim

THE SPONSORS FOR LIBBY DENEBEIM ARE:

Robert S. Denebeim, 200 St Francis Blvd., Businessman
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Patricia E. Costello, 2836 Green St., Community Leader
Carlatia T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2020 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood Dr., PTA Volunteer
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Police Commissioner
Cynthia Brown Kelly, 460 Magellan St., Homemaker
Myna G. Kopf, 1940-12th Ave., Board of Education Member
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan St., Lt. Governor
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Attorney/Businessman
Carole Migden, 561-26th St., Mental Health Director
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., President, Board of Supervisors
Phillip Bruce Rafal, 962 Clayton St., SF Open Space Committee Member
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Labor/Gay Ledaer
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., Teacher/President, SF Federation of Teachers
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Regent, University of California
Pansy Poncio Waller, 649 San Jose Ave., Contract Compliance Representative
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Malcolm S.M. Watts, 270 Seacliff Ave., Physician

GEORGE DYKSTRA

My address is 949 Filbert Street
My occupation is Community Services Director
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am trained in government finance and Citizen Participation decision making. Long community involvement includes director, Educational Services, Executive Board of Golden Gate Child Development, Saint Mary’s Hospital Board and Yick Wo Elementary Parent’s Committee. My education includes a B.A., emphasizing Education and U.S.C. graduate school.

I am practical, experienced and positive. I expect more from students, parents and teachers. I promise fiscal responsibility. I respect and support parent participation, teacher professionalism and every student’s right to learn in well-equipped, orderly schools. Opportunity, Technology and Basics.

Vote for me! I will keep children in the picture.

George Dykstra

THE SPONSORS FOR GEORGE DYKSTRA ARE:

Lisa Bardaro, M.D., 880 Sloat Blvd., Physician
Milton E. Buxton, 80 Parnassus Ave., Educator
Robert T. Corrado, 18 Miramar Ave., Administrator
Teresa M. D’Auroy, 75 Heather St., Environmental Fund Raising
Kathleen DePaola, 949 Filbert St., Psychologist
Kathleen Dykstra, 949 Filbert St., Legal Administrator
Linda J. Gauldrau, 858-26th Ave., Director of Medical Records
Teresone Hallinan, 41 Grattan St., Attorney-at-Law
Ann K. Howell-Ison, 904 Cortland Ave., Volunteer Coordinator
D. S. Inaba, 44 Escondido Ave., Associate Professor
Martha Anne Jessup, 2562 Diamond St., Educator
Deborah L. Keller, 1466-41 Ave., Student
Katherine Lambert, 63 Winfield St., Women’s Services Consultant
Mimi Landry, 1040 Cole St., Student
Nick Lederer, 79 Mizpah St., Executive Director, Senior Services
Dr. Thomas S. McCoy, 1446 Clay St., Professor
Tim P. Mess, M.D.D.5 Lundy’s Ln., AIDS Clinic-Researcher
Susan L. Mok, 1332-38th Ave., Acupuncture
Marcia Quackenbush, 1690-27th Ave., Social Worker
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 958 Ingerson Ave., Executive Director
CAHEED

Mervyn F. Silverman, 119 Frederick St., Director of Health
Kenneth M. Simms., 1454 Palou Ave., Associate Director Child Development Center
David E. Smith, 80 Parnassus Ave., Physician
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello St., Attorney
Michael Stepanian, 2109 Baker St., Attorney
Harvey W. O. Tse, 70 Lomita Ave., Businessman
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliartas, Methodist Minister
E. Leif Zerkin, 1326-26th Ave., Editor

STATEMENTS ARE VOLUNTEERED BY THE CANDIDATES AND HAVE NOT BEEN CHECKED FOR ACCURACY.
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MARTIN ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street
My occupation is Certified Public Accountant/Financial Consultant
My qualifications for office are: Twelve years of community and civic service.

Issues
Eng supports:
- Our children’s inherent right for education.
- Regain respect for our teachers.
- Strict measures to halt school violence. Stop the sale and use of street drugs.
- Higher standards for teachers and students.
- Encourage teachers and parents participation within the Board.
- Merit pay to outstanding teachers.

Maximize income: Lease surplus school properties. End mismanagement by incompetent Board members.

Eng opposes:
- Current programs teaching alternative lifestyle to our precious children. A violation of the First Amendment.
- Board members extravagant dinner meetings with liquor paid for by taxpayers. A blatant violation of the law.

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:

John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Real Estate Broker, Former Supervisor
John Roridan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College District
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Commissioner, Contractors State License Board, State of California
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., Professor, Former Supervisor
Dr. John B. Tsu, 2 Denlows Dr., Education Commissioner
Melvin M. Belli, 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Ter., Landmark Preservation Board
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
C. Mackey E. Salazar, 183 San Benito Way, City Planning Commissioner
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli St., Retired
John T. Pang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher, State Parks and Recreation Commissioner
Robert Silvestri, 3000-23rd Ave., State Assembly Nominee
Anna Kyle Pausewang, 30 Cunningham Pl., Legal Assistant
Tony Kilroy, 473-11th Ave., Vice President, District One Political Action
Kevin G. Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Property Consultant
John S. Tang, M.D. 2184 Funston Ave., Physician
Timothy A. Tosta, 870 Ashbury St., Attorney
Jung Roy Gee, 665 Pine St., Investor, Education Researcher
William Bernstein, 1000 Franklin St., Attorney
Robert P. Varni, 10 Miller Pl., Chairman-Police Data Systems
Frank S. Yee, 358 Los Palmos Dr., Real Estate Finance; Teacher
Rev. Charles A. McHenny, 1350 Lawton St., Clergy
William Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney at Law
F. Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Lawyer
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis Ter., V.P-Branch Manager, S & L
Velma Petersuille, 665 Pine St., Teacher
Ed Pond, 16-38th Ave., Insurance broker/Accountant
S.M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Business Enterprises/Lawyer
Frank N. Alioto, 2800 Vallejo St., Restaurant Owner
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 444 Corett AVE., President, San Francisco Taxpayers Assn.

EUGENE S. HOPP, M.D.

My address is 601 Van Ness Avenue, Opera Plaza
My occupation is Physician
My qualifications for office are: For the past thirteen years I have served on the Board of Education as an independent voice committed to the goal of educating all our children to their fullest potential. The current stress on teaching the basics must continue, combined with offerings of high technology and vocational courses designed to prepare our diverse student population for a changing future. I stand for an integrated educational program and welcome parents and the public to assist me in this challenge.

Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.

The sponsors for Dr. Eugene S. Hopp are:

Molly M. Hopp, 601 Van Ness Ave., Telecommunications Executive
Dianne Feinstein, 3020 Lyon St., Mayor
Joseph L. Alioto, 2510 Pacific Ave., Attorney
Bill Maher, 69 Elsie St., Supervisor
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Member, Board of Education
Agrupino R. Cerbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, Vice President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr, 433 Bartlett St., President, Police Commission
Burt A. Tolier, 581 Orizaba Ave., Police Commissioner
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Police Commissioner
Alan S. Wong 1280 Ellis St., Commissioner, Community College
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member S F Community College
John F. Crowley, 87 Los Palmos Dr., Labor Official
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Investor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Amos J. Castro, 1401 California St., Physician
Henry Dur, 439-45th Ave., Civil Rights Administrator
Harry Polland, 637 Powell St., Economist
Saul Madfes, 75 Country Club Dr., Retired, School Admin.
Jo Birnbaum, 1750 Taylor St., Housewife
Anita H. Sanchez, 48 Restani Way, Social Worker
Chadwick C. Ertola, 660 Greenwich St., Attorney
Naomi Gray, 1291 Stanyan St., Businesswoman
Dorothy M. Casper, 475 Chestnut St., Property Management
Raya G. Richardson, 1714 Fillmore St., Assoc. Professor
Max L. Christensen, 2 Heather Ave., Clergyman
Larry Mazzola, 3060-24th Ave., Assz Business Mgr.
Leo J. Murphy, Sr., 61 Annapolis Ter., Real Estate Broker
Lane E. De Lara, 2 Lenox Way, Educational Consultant
Gregory C. Lintner, 2660 Webster St., Realtor

Statements are voluntarily by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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TERRY HUGUNIN
My address is 1824 Noriega Street
My occupation is Consultant
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: Those of us who were teenagers during President Kennedy’s Appolo Space Program thought there was nothing we and our nation might not accomplish: “We’re going to the moon in ten years!” Thanks to outfits like the National Education Association, the science oriented New Frontiers of the 60’s have given way to the “other-directedness” of the Aquarian Age. Their goal: form a society of androgynous pacifists—study their literature. Mine is to restore the problem-solving orientation appropriate to Judeo-Christian culture. Help me mobilize our schools to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative and overcome the nuclear war threat.

Terry Hugunin

JAMES LEGARE
My address is 254 Oak Street
My occupation is Motor Truck Operator
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am committed to installing a sound educational program in our schools as the basis for getting our country and economy moving again—in the American tradition. We need to develop young minds through a program of classical education and to protect them by wiping out drugs in the schools and in the nation.

I propose to reform the school system along these lines:
1) Classical geometry and physics, as typified by Plato, Archimedes, Cusa Kepler, and Leibniz
2) Classical poetry, music, and drama, exemplified by Homer, Aeschylus, Dante, Shakespeare, Schiller, Bach, and Beethoven

James Legare

The sponsors for Terry Hugunin are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elinore Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
David L. Kelber, 1901 Noriega St., Management Consultant
Susan E. Kelber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
James Legare, 254 Oak St., Motor Truck Operator
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

The sponsors for James Legare are:
Carlos Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Stock Worker
Enrique Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Retired Carpenter
Graciela Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., Student
Leticia Altamirano, 750 Sweeney St., College Student
Philip A. Belich, 3256 Folsom St., Millman
Howard M. Coelman, 537 Belvedere St., Fortlift Operator
Michael Fraijo, 1824 Noriega St., Student
James K. Graham, 474 Hearst Ave., Retired
Elinore Hardy, 143 Farallones St., Housewife
Andrea K. Ingraham, 1637 Noriega St., Educator
Ruby T. Jimenez, 961 Delano Ave., Directory Sales Representative
Susan E. Kelber, 1901 Noriega St., Musician
Andrew A. Klein, 1709-16th Ave., Consultant
Micaela M. Lezcano, 376 Capistrano Ave., Housewife
CleEsther Miller, 52 Ralston St., Foster Mother
Nick Pace, 130 Campbell Ave., Railroad Employee
Sandra Parks, 16 Garces St., Railroad Employee
Marcia K. Patch, 1302 Taylor St., Administrative Officer
Lidia G. Portillo, 115 Blanken Ave., Retired
David Shayman, 1644-14th Ave., Pharmacist
Conner Soules, 1645 Noriega St., Sales
Michael Staninec, 2364-32nd Ave., Dentist
Nicholas E. Vallejo, 875 Cayuga Ave., Electrician
John Vozaitis, 1330 Ninth Ave., Restaurant Owner

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

JO ANNE MILLER
My address is 1920 Quint Street
My occupation is Parent and Teacher
My qualifications for office are: I am the mother of two children in San Francisco Public Schools. I believe in the Public School System, and have a personal interest in its quality and effectiveness. I am a teacher of the blind. I am President of the Glen Park School Site Advisory Committee, and hold other elected civic offices.

The lack of parent representation on the School Board has contributed to a lack of parent and citizen involvement, a lack of long-term planning and vision in school administration, and a failure to commit the School District to a plan and goal of excellence for all children.

JoAnne Miller

BEN TOM
My address is 1717 Jones Street
My occupation is Transportation Analyst
My qualifications for office are: I believe I have provided outstanding leadership during my eight years on the San Francisco Board of Education. This is evidenced by the fact that test scores have improved and new programs have attracted students back from private schools.

As an active parent, I know San Francisco's schools first-hand. I have worked conscientiously for our children's future. I have the vision and I have gained the practical skills necessary to continue building our school district into one of the best large urban districts in the nation.

Benjamin Tom

The sponsors for JoAnne Miller are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Specialist
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Angel D. Contreras, 1461 Alabama St., Administrator of Headstart
Catherine J. Dodd, 61 Dening St., President, San Francisco NOW
Linda Fried, 590-35th Ave., Community Organizer
Bob Geary, 2578 Greater Highway, San Francisco Police Officer
Louise Harvey, 673 Fulton St., Educational Consultant
Marlee Hearne, 3030 Turk Blvd., Teacher
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney Investigator
Daroe Inouye, 251 Gates St., Attorney
Clev Jones, 385-18th St., Legislative Assistant
LeRoy King, 75 Sampson Ln., Reg. Dir., ILWU
Myra G. Kofp, 1940-12th Ave., School Board Member
Jean E. Korkum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro St., Sculptor
Bill Maher, 69 Eslie St., Member of Board of Supervisors
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Business Executive
Hugh B. Miller, 355 Roosevelt Way, Attorney
John L. Molinarini, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
James E. O'Connor, 72 Merced Ave., Taxi Cab Owner
Shirley Jones Rhodes, 558 Ingersoll Ave., Executive Director, CAHEED, Inc.
Jerry Ringerman, 485 Crestmont Dr., Executive Director, San Francisco Jewish Community Center
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Performing Arts Administrator
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., SF Area Director, SBE
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., President, AAFUM

The sponsors for Ben Tom are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Wendy Neldor, 150 Casitas Ave., Supervisor
Harry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Supervisor, San Francisco
John L. Molinarini, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commission
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Thomas Heahl, 4 Corre St., Police Commissioner
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director, CYO
Jerry E. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney/Commissioner
Jesp T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Travel Agent
Ben L. Hom, 1 Villa Tar., Banker, Executive
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker, Community College Board Member
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director, Pre-Trial Diversion Project
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Supervisor, City and County Supervisors
Sala Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Bill Maher, 69 Eslie St., Supervisor
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrider St., Planning Commissioner
Myra G. Kofp, 1940-12th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Sodonia M. Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Board Member School Administrator
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Sal Rosselli, 549 Lexington St., Labor Business Representative
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Supervisor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Board Member, SF Community College
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman, 16th District

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

ERNEST “CHUCK” AYALA

My address is 4402-20th Street
My occupation is Youth Director, CYO-Urban Development Division

My qualifications for office are: Native San Franciscan, South of Market neighborhood. Attended public and parochial schools, including City and Lone Mountain Colleges. My involvement in community development and public service is with youth in Education, Employment and Delinquency Prevention, in addition to developing and administrating Senior Citizens and Veterans Programs. Business management background in labor, insurance, and real estate provides me with a balanced approach to fiscal and administrative objectives of the Community College District. My continued goal for the Community College District is to retain its open door policy and remain receptive to the educational and vocational needs of the people.

Ernest Chuck Ayala

The sponsors for Ernest “Chuck” Ayala are:
Reginald Y. Alexander, 182 Middlefield Dr., Vice Chancellor, Certificated
Bernice E. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Homemaker
Louis F. Baitmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor S.F. Community College District
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, S.F. Community College Board
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Retired
Manuel Ceballos, 2872 25th St., Beer Wholesaler
Tina Burgess Coan, 59 Chabot St., House Wife
Marjorie M Colvin, 1835 Franklin St. #1403, Housewife
Peter J. Fatooh, 30 Grand View Ave., Businessman
William L. Fazio, 110 Inverness Dr., Ass't District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley St., Management Consultant
Al Graf, 859 Bryant St., Businessman
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Marcel Kapulica, 2470 22nd Ave., Dental Laboratory-Owner
Louis E. Lagger, 4001 21st St., District Manager, Packing Co.
Dorothy J. Lubcrich, 15 Fiorentino St., Retired
Ernestine A. McGoldrick, 4442 20th St., School Clerk/Housewife
Charles W. Meyers, Sr., 1789 Eucalyptus St., State Assemblyman- Retired
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Susan Ann Ronalds, 340-A Taraval St., Florist
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., President, S.F. Police Commission
Bob (Robert) Schmidt, 4048 21st St., Librarian
Thomatia N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Youth Program Coordinator
Burt A. Toler, 581 Oriaza St., Educator/Police Commissioner
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Commissioner, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Bernard J. Ward, 3300 Kirkham St., Atty at law
Bill Zorzakis, 545 Castro St., Shoe Repairer

AMOS CLEOPHILUS BROWN

My address is 111 Lunado Way
My occupation is Clergyman
My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: I hold the B.A., M.Div. and D.D. degrees. 16 years of public service on boards of education throughout the U.S. more than qualifies me for the position.

My services on the Board of Governors since 1982 reflect that I am competent and able to work with a team of governors to ensure the delivery of a quality education system for all persons in our community who desire training for marketable skills. Community College also must serve the needs of those who for various reasons have not had the opportunity of going to other institutions of higher learning for training.

Amos C. Brown

The sponsors for Amos C. Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Member, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member, Community College Board
Priscilla A. Denard, 210 Broad St., Secretary
James Gordon Emerson, Jr., 175 Beaumont St., Clergyman
Mayor Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
H. Welton Flynn, 75 Venus St., Public Accountant
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega St., Minister
Zelma R. Harrison, 1957 Hayes St., Bookkeeper
Richard D. Hongisto, 114 Broderick St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Grandville A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, Retired
Clifton R. Jeffers, 1883 14th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., Attorney/Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 30 16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 360 Precita Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Lauraret Newkirk, 554 Brussels St., System Support Librarian
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Vice President, S.F. Community College Board
Naomi Shines, 756 Page St., Fiscal Clerk
Rabbit Malcolm, 5 Presidio, 1059 Clement St., Rabbi
Julie Tang, 788 18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., President, Board of Education
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilarius St.,  Minister
Hannibal A. Williams, 1249 Scott St., Clergyman
Tomothy R. Wolfdorf, 91 Sanchez, President, College Board
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Social Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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PATRICK C. FITZGERALD
My address is 128 Detroit Street
My occupation is San Francisco County Central Committee, 16th Assembly District.
My age is 49
My qualifications for office are: • Am married, father of three children and a homeowner
• Graduated: St. Ignatius College Prep. and City College of San Francisco
• Elected San Francisco County Central Committee
  (since 1970)
• California State Central Committee (since 1978)
• Attended San Francisco 1984 National Presidential Convention for Mondale-Ferrero
• Served on San Francisco City Government CATV Task Force Educational Access Committee
• Instrumental in adoption of San Francisco City College Labor Studies Program
• Great Nephew of former San Francisco County Supervisor Tom O'Dowd
• Past Secretary San Francisco County Central Committee
• Strong opponent 1983 Feinstein Recall
• Successfully fought peripheral canal
• Support Propositions: 33 (disabled homeowners) and 40 (political campaign reform).

The sponsors for Patrick C. Fitzgerald are:
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney
Lee S. Dolson, 1755 Beach St., College Professor
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Labor Leader
Terence Faulkner, 2371-42nd Ave., Former City Commissioner
Marion L. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Social Worker
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Tax Consultant/Bookkeeper
Josephine Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., State Central Committeewoman

ONE OF PATRICK C. FITZGERALD'S VOTES IN THIS DISTRICT

DEAN GOODMAN
My address is 825 Geary Street #703
My occupation is Retired Teacher/Actor
My age is 64
My qualifications for office are: Thirty years of teaching, an educator's concern for quality instruction, and a citizen's awareness of the need for budget control. As the first fulltime president of the Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 2121 and as a former staff member of the District I know well the policies and procedures which form the structure of the Community College and the College Centers.

If elected, I will insist on fair hiring practices, and as a member of that most diverse of all groups, our Senior Citizens, I will support college services for all adults regardless of individual differences.

The sponsors for Dean Goodman are:
Priscilla Alden, 1677 Bush St., #8, Actress
Ugo Baldassari, 988 Dolores St., Theatre Director
James E. Ballant, 2 Arbor St., Teacher
Sheldon I. Balman, 5 Perego Ter., Attorney
Laurent R. Broussal, 855 Quintara St., Administrator, Community College
Kimo Cochran, 1330 Bush St., Bar Owner
Donald G. Clément, 117 Ord St., Refugee Resettlement Counselor
Lauri Fried-Lee, 435 19th Ave., Community College Instructor
William Gundel, 1415 Franklin St., Credit Adjuster
Frances T. Hughes, 2649 Polk St., Legal Secretary
Donna Ilyin, 76 6th Ave., Counselor
Lynda Bergan Kalb, 24 Magnolia St., Singer/Actress
Michael J. Mandel, 12 Marina St., Attorney
Donald G. Miller, 26 Leo St., Furniture Manufacturer
Jay Moran, 1677 Page St., Business Representative
Alien Nomura, 177 Bocana St., Theatrical Photographer
Judy Winn-Bell Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Teacher/Author/Editor
Roger E. W-B Olsen, 1282 29th Ave., Publisher
Frank Reilly, 3415 Divisadero St., Advertising/Actor
James J. Reilly, 2058 Jefferson St., Attorney
Rev. James E. Sandmire, 432 Buchanan St., Minister
Eve Stoddard, 180 Diamond St., Probate Administration
Daniel A. Sullivan, 1590 Sacramento St., Attorney
Doug Thanham, 701 Taylor St., Pianist
Sigrid Wunschmidt, 1142 DeHaro St., Actress
Samuel L. Zanze, 2581 25th Ave., Businessman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ANDRE F. PEHARGOU
My address is 3840 Fulton Street
My occupation is Civil Servant
My qualifications for office are: I have been a resident of San Francisco for 34 years. I am a graduate of California State University San Francisco; San Francisco City College, and Lowell High School.
Most taxpayers are not benefitting from the Community College System due to lack of information and lack of convenient locations.
As a Board member, I will advocate a strong academic curriculum; More neighborhood locations to facilitate Senior citizens and working taxpayers; Better utilization of present facilities, and a decrease in tuition fees for City residents.
If you want expanded services to help benefit you, give me your support on election day.

Andre F. Pehargou

The sponsors for Adre F. Pehargou are:
William Angelopoulos, 59 Pregunta St., Employed
Renee Boulay, 605 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Josephine Bacchilli, 353 25th Ave., Retired
Andre Carrey, 487 2nd Ave., Retired
James Edward Coleman, 620 Banks St., Supervisor
Alice Crowe, 1827 Balboa St., Part Time Office Worker
Robert S. Flahavan, 151 Buchanan St., Operations Officer, S. F. Airport
Emma Garrigues, 2702 Anza St., Retired
Diana Huntman, 361 25th Ave., Teacher
Rose Huntman, 720 La Playa St., #307, Retired
Paulette Henderson, 798 Naples St., Retired
Paul Kepler, 3832 Fulton St., Concierge
Anna Konor, 3315 Irving St., Retired
James Courtney Kovach, 1282 43rd Ave., Lithographer
Eva Lim, 3832 Fulton St., Asst. Paymistress
D. Martin, 87 Seward St., Supervisor

JULIE TANG
My address is 788-18th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: Bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of San Francisco; Master's in Education from Stanford University; Juris Doctorate from Hastings College of Law; a wife, mother, former teacher and counselor; and presently, Assistant District Attorney in San Francisco.
I have served diligently, always conscious of my responsibility to all the communities of San Francisco who gave me the highest number of votes four years ago. I strive to ensure that the Community College will continue providing quality education to all students, even during financial crises, without sacrificing student or faculty needs. As the only woman board member, I actively support women's issues.

Julie Tang

The sponsors for Julie Tang are:
Sal a Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Congresswoman
John Yehali Chinn, 3146 Lyon St., School Principal
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 783-A Guerrero St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member Board of Supervisors
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., Univ. of Calif Regent
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Commissioner, Board of Education/School Administrator
Arlo E. Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney of San Francisco
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant SF Sheriff's Dept.
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., President, Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member SF Community College Board
Madeleine H. Russell, 3778 Washington St., Investments
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Planning Commissioner
Agrinio R. Ceratos, 471 Hoffman Ave., Electrical Engineer
Michael Hennessey, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Anne Beaside Daley, 705 Geny Blvd., Executive Director
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member SF Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Linda A. Post, 1846-15th St., Community Activist
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Author/Educator
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona St., Incumbent SF Supervisor
Bette W. Landa, 44 Entrada Ct., Volunteer
Ron Huberman, 81 Walter St., District Attorney's Investigator
Jeffrey K. Mori, 360 Prececa Ave., Executive Director

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

My address is 910 Shotwell Street
My occupation is Educator

My qualifications for office are: Bachelor of Science in Education, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Arts in Educational Administration, Doctor of Education candidate, Community College Administrator/Organizer/Worker, Graduate School Professor, National Scholar.

Experiences: Teacher in pre-school and elementary grades, high school instructor, college professor in state education universities and private colleges, community worker/organizer.

I believe that excellence in education in community colleges could be attained through the united effort of the faculty and administration whose main responsibility is superior teaching for professional and occupational goals. Knowledge is constantly changing and challenging; therefore community colleges must work for quality education for all.

Moy Velasquez

The sponsors for Moy Velasquez are:

Lilian Aldea, 231 Granada Ave., Teacher
Concepcion G. Bustos, 49 Capp St., Teacher
Melandro Bustos, 49 Capp St., Student
Vicenzoa G. Bustos, 49 Capp St., Mechanic
Stasia Cagara, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Sales
Rosita T. Castaneda, 18 Guy Pl., Teacher’s Aide
Encarnacion P. Cespedes, 931 Prague St., Teacher
Cheryl R. Conrad, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Student
Theresa N. Fabro, 418 Mission St., School Lunchroom Manager
Kenneth A. Guerra, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Technician
Odilia Jones, 1775 Newcomb Ave., Housekeeper
Felicia P. Misenas, 266 Brighton Ave., School Lunch Helper
Basil C. Nickerson, 336-6th St., Self Employed
Willie B. Nicholas, 1231-5th Ave., Custodian
Jack Lee Ponedawash, 1219 South Van Ness Ave., Food Production Manager
Margaret M. Powers, 1207 South Van Ness Ave., Customer Service
Clarice D. Robinson, 2445 Harrison St., Teacher’s Aide
Encarnacion A. Ramos, 2700 Folsom St., Room Cleaner
Murdie Washington, 195 Highland St., Monitor
David A. Woodard, 397 Green St., Chef

DR. TIM WOLFRED

My address is 91 Sanchez Street
My occupation is Incumbent, President, San Francisco Community College Board

My qualifications for office are: As an incumbent, I am proud of a College Board that, with less dollars than it had four years ago, has kept all programs operating and has expanded services to San Franciscans most dependent on a healthy community college system for access to job skills training and a basic college education. Neighborhood college centers have moved into larger, renovated facilities. Vocational offerings in fields like computer technologies, nursing, and auto mechanics have been updated. Classes in language skills have been strengthened in immigrant communities. We are a Board dedicated to quality education open to all San Franciscans.

Dr. Tim Wolfred

The sponsors for Dr. Tim Wolfred are:

Saida Burton, 8 Staat Blvd., Congresswoman
Willie Brown, 1200 Gough St., Assembly Member
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assembly Member
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, San Francisco District Attorney
Michael Hennessy, 261 Anderson St., Sheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Doris Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise Reene, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 30-16th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Bill Maher, 69 Elysie St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 950 Duncan St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Henry G. Britt, 783 Guerrero St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Alan Weng, 1280 Ellis St., Member, Community College Board
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., Member, Community College Board
John Rirdan, 1426 Willard St., Member, Community College Board
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., Member, Community College Board
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., School Board Member
Sodonia Wilson, 540 Darien Way, School Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., School Board Member
Libby Denebein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., School Board Member
Agrupino R. Corbatos, 471 Hoffman Ave, School Board Member
Carlotta T. del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner

Yori Wada, 563-4th Ave., University of California Regent
Harold Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas St., Pastor, Glide Church
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher
Sandy Mori, 360 Prectic Ave., Administrator
Thomas Peretti, 378-16th St., Banker
Paul Boneberg, 647 Castro St., House Painter
Sal Rosselli, 349 Lexington St., Union Official
Carole Migden, 563-28th St., Executive Director, Operation Concern

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
**Port Revenue Bonds**

**PROPOSITION A**

Shall the Port Commission be authorized to issue $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance construction and improvements of Port facilities?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Port Commission operates the Port of San Francisco. When funds are needed for Port construction or improvements, the Commission may issue revenue bonds to raise funds. A majority of the voters must approve these bonds before they can be issued. The revenue bonds are then paid from Port revenues.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition A would allow the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance several improvements of Port property. These improvements include modernizing container handling facilities, upgrading various piers, constructing a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, and renovating certain other Port structures and property. The bonds would then be paid off from Port revenues.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the Port Commission to issue up to $42,500,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements of Port property.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the Port Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

**Controller’s Statement on “A”**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$ 42,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>81,761,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$124,261,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning four years after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $4,462,000 to a maximum of $5,760,000 annually for twenty-seven years.

"In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Port sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Port. Analysis of projected resources available to the Port indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years."

**How Supervisors Voted on “A”**

On July 30 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on a motion placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Bill Maher, John Molinari, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

**NO:** Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION A APPEARS ON PAGE 51.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The revitalization of the Port of San Francisco will bring new jobs and new tax revenue to the City. A healthy port, with increased ship traffic, will bring millions each year to the San Francisco economy.

By delaying modernizations in the past, the Port of San Francisco lost the bulk of its maritime business to other Bay Area and West Coast cities. The same mistakes must not be made twice. We must allow the Port to use revenues to finance continued improvements.

Proposition A does not authorize any new taxes. Proposition A simply authorizes the Port to use revenues to finance improvements and expansion.

Proposition A will allow for the modernization of existing container cargo terminals on the southern waterfront. These improved facilities will retain current business and will bring new lines to San Francisco. The return of the shipping business will bring back long lost blue collar jobs to the waterfront as well as white collar jobs.

In addition, Proposition A will provide for expansion of the passenger facility, a new breakwater to protect the commercial fishing fleet, and improved rail access to the port. In all, Proposition A will upgrade and modernize San Francisco Port facilities so as to make them competitive with other ports across the Bay and throughout the West Coast.

The complete modernization effort will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. Instead, the Port of San Francisco’s income will be used to finance long-term revenue bonds.

The people of San Francisco deserve a first-rate port. We urge all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote YES on Proposition A.

As Mayor, I have worked hard to restore our port to its historic pre-eminence as a major gateway to the Far East.

Once again, major shipping lines are docking in San Francisco. Just recently, two of the largest container vessel operators, China Ocean Shipping Corporation and Columbus Lines, signed agreements to use this port.

Not only modern cargo carriers, but passenger liners as well are being drawn to San Francisco in a remarkable renaissance of maritime commerce.

But if there is to be a lasting renewal of our waterfront, the port must be competitive with other port cities anxiously contending for the burgeoning Pacific trade. The port, if it is to prosper, must modernize and enlarge its basic maritime facilities.

That’s the purpose of Proposition A.

Proposition A will make the Port of San Francisco truly and vigorously competitive. And it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.

Proposition A will authorize $42.5 million in revenue bonds for vital waterfront projects, including the conversion of Pier 80 into a modern, state-of-the-art container facility and the enlargement and modernization of cargo operations at Piers 94 and 96.

Additionally, Proposition A will provide funds for repairing the now deteriorating Jefferson Street Seawall and will match Federal dollars for construction of a much-needed breakwater to protect the City’s fishing fleet at Fisherman’s Wharf.

Proposition A also will finance expansion of the passenger terminal at Pier 35.

Proposition A is a prudent investment in the City’s future. And these bonds are payable only from port revenues—your taxes will not be increased.

More ships, with more cargo and more passengers, mean more jobs and greater economic vitality for our city.

Proposition A will make our port, once again, a strong and lasting competitor for the commerce of the Pacific Basin. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco needs a good, working port. Vote yes on Proposition A and help bring it about.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Citizens of San Francisco are worried about the deterioration of the port. Most of us can remember when the port was a thriving, bustling commercial enterprise, and the docks were maintained, clean, efficient, and busy. But, the port has not adapted to container cargo, and may be losing the few shipping lines that it now serves. We must restructure the docks for active container shipping, and bring in railway lines to service the docks.

We have one of the few deep water ports in America, an essential for modern shipping. LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT BEING ONE OF THE BEST PORTS IN THE WEST AGAIN!

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Wendy Nelder
President of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will permit the Port of San Francisco to issue bonds to finance needed construction and improvements. This would give the Port the same financing ability the Airport now has.

Through the issuance of revenue bonds, the Port would be able to undertake necessary improvements AT NO COST TO TAXPAYERS.

San Francisco deserves a modern, thriving port. Proposition A will help us build modern terminals, a breakwater at Fisherman's Wharf which will help keep commercial fishermen in San Francisco, repair the seawall at Jefferson Street and expand our Passenger Terminal to handle increased cruise business that brings millions of dollars into our local economy.

Proposition A will give the Port of San Francisco the ability to make these kinds of improvements. Please join me in voting YES.

Sala Burton,
Member of Congress

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A offers San Franciscans the opportunity to direct the future of the Port of San Francisco.

This measure will provide our Port with the key to the future.

We must keep pace with new developments, increase cargo and create new jobs. For every fifty new containers we move, 1.67 new jobs will be created.

This measure also includes funding for construction of the Fisherman's Wharf Breakwater, which is critically needed and long overdue.

Take part in the future of our Port. Join with me in voting YES on Proposition A.

Milton Marks,
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a waterfront city. We have a superb natural harbor, which is also one of the few really deep water harbors—vital for modern deep water cargo ships.

We have used our badly deteriorating and long unimproved pier facilities to their maximum efficiency. But... times are changing. We must move NOW to keep pace with new developments, or risk enormous losses in cargo shipping, commercial fishing, and tourist trade.

It is ESSENTIAL that we adapt to container cargo that can be moved by train, truck, and ship.

Research has been done on what could give us the greatest increase in efficiency and profits for the very least amount of money. And the answer is: modernizing the South Terminal for adaptation to container cargo; providing rail access to the docks; protecting the commercial fishing fleet with a breakwater; and expanding passenger-handling facilities for cruise passenger tourists.

Prop A will provide these improvements RIGHT NOW. And... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A.

VOTE YES ON PROP A!

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
Arthur H. Coleman, President
James Rudden, Vice President
Gordon Lau, Member
Anne Halsted, Member
James Herman, Member
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Fisherman’s Wharf is a valued segment of the community and needs your help to ensure its economic well-being.

A YES vote on Proposition A will provide the needed financing to build the long awaited breakwater to ensure the safety of our commercial fishing fleet, create new berths and new jobs.

A YES vote on Proposition A will repair the Jefferson Street Seawall before it becomes a dangerous hazard to our visitors and to our community.

A YES vote will insure the economic vitality of Fisherman’s Wharf as well as the entire San Francisco Waterfront.

Join with us and vote YES.

John L. Molinari, Supervisor
Louis Ferrari, President
Crab Boat Owner's Association

Christopher Martin
President, Fisherman’s Wharf Merchant Assoc.
Fritz Arko
Alessandro Baccari
Ex. Secretary, Fisherman’s Wharf Merchant Assoc.
L. B. Barnes
Fisherman’s Wharf Seafood
Phil Bentivegna
Fishing Boat Butchie B
Bob Bugato
California Shell Fish Co.
Ken Burger
Franciscan Restaurant
Pat Flanagan
Standard Fisheries
Anthony Casali
Fishing Boat Norene

Virgil P. Caselli, Native
S. Joseph Cucotta
F. Alioto Fish Co.
Nick D’Amato
Fishing Boat Nicky D
Nino Geraldi
Tom Lazio
Tom Lazio Fish Co.
Andrew Lolli
William McDonnell
Albert Spadaro
Sports Fishing Boat
New Florics
Mario J. Alioto
Calif. Seafood Institute
Peter Brown
The Anchorage

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The opportunity is NOW!

Our Northern Waterfront is alive with activity—increase in passenger ships, thriving commercial developments.

Let us fuse that energy into our Southern Waterfront and take advantage of our natural deep water. That means newer, deeper draft merchant ships, increased cargoes and new jobs.

Missed opportunities cannot be recaptured. So act now! Don’t let this opportunity get away.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jack Crowley
See/Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Le Roy King
Regional Director ILWU
Tim Twomey, President
San Francisco Central Labor Council
Paul Dempster
San Francisco Maritime Trade Council
Chuck Mack, President
Teamsters Joint Council No. 7

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our waterfront is an outstandingly beautiful and profitable aspect of San Francisco. The port has been badly neglected, however. We need to VOTE YES ON PROP A to improve and rebuild cargo and passenger facilities.

PROP A will guarantee increased maritime activities, new jobs, the revival of our fishing industry, and the safety of shoreline areas.

And... AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!

For our neighborhood, and for our City, VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Phyllis Kern
Golden Gate Democratic Club* Open Space Committee*
Jim Wachob
District 8 Democratic Club*
Kevin Malone
District 8 Democratic Club*
Bette Landis
Democratic Women’s Forum*
Rebecca Evans
Sierra Club*
Beverly Karnatz
Committee for Better Parks
and Recreation in Chinatown*

Richard Livingston
Adria Garabedian
Andrea Jepson
Madrid Hamilton
Dr. Tim Wolfred
Wallinda McCrea
Douglas Engmann
Dale Carlson
Stafford Buckley
Dick Pabich
Ron Huberman

*for identification purposes only
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

San Francisco has always been a great port city. And the San Francisco Port has always been a leading employer of minorities.

But the Port has sadly deteriorated. It has not kept up with modernizations and improvements. And what is even worse, it has not kept up with the competition. The Port MUST adapt to container cargo, and put in railway access to the docks. With your vote YES ON A, we can take advantage of our deep water harbor, attract more shipping trade, increase cargoes, and produce many more jobs.

And . . . AT NO COST TO THE TAXPAYER!
VOTE YES ON PROP A!

Naomi Gray      Mabel Schine
Doris Thomas    Linda Dickens
J. E. Thomas    Faye Anderson
A. Brooks      Zuretti Goosby
Frankie Gillette Stan Palomares-Criollos
Lois DeCayette Jene Rita Alviar
Joel DeCayette Ernest C. Ayala
Julie Anderson Alan S. Wong
Altheda Carrie Stan Moy
George Newkirk Douglas S. Chan
Elouise Westbrook Thomas Hsieh
Shirley Jones Alicia Wang
Clifton Jeffers Ben Tom
Joe Williams    Pius Lee
Carol Belle     Julie Tang
Benjamin James Louis Hop Lee
Grandvel Jackson Dennis Wong
Amos Brown      Melvin Dong Lee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Our Port now needs $42 million to develop San Francisco’s maritime facilities to compete with ports such as Oakland, Seattle and San Diego. These improved facilities are vital to San Francisco’s competition for jobs and trade for the Pacific. Currently all major west coast ports are building to meet the growing needs of America’s Pacific Trade. These ports have each spent an average of $57 million on recent container cargo expansion while San Francisco has spent nothing.

San Francisco must have at least comparable facilities in order to compete in this market. If the port is not developed for container cargo, San Francisco can forget about being a major port on the west coast as well as lose the jobs and revenue that a modern port could produce.

The Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that you vote to bring San Francisco the jobs and business that will be created by these revenue bonds. The bonds will be paid off from Port revenue and there is no taxpayer risk.

If you want to see the Port continue to grow and prosper vote yes on Proposition A.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reconstruct municipal harbor facilities!!!:

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman
Dr. Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

Juanita G. Raven
Democratic County Committeeman
Arlo Hale Smith
Bob Geary
Democratic County Committeeman
Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Martin Eng

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

When something is railroaded through City Hall on a “fast track”, it is always difficult not to join the stampede. This, however, is a bond issue in an amount larger than necessary to perform the actual work contemplated; not backed by written leases; and not backed even by “letter agreements” with corporations which supposedly will use Piers 80, 94 and 96 if improvements are made. This bond issue was rushed through the Board of Supervisors. Transmitted to the Board on July 24th, a scant six days later (on July 30th) and without a specific noticed public hearing, the Board voted 7-1 to place it on the ballot. I dissented because more time was needed for proper analysis and public input.

Presently, the Port has a debt service requirement of approximately $104,000,000.00. This proposed revenue bond issue would increase the debt service requirement to $228,261,400.00; a staggering rise. The $42,500,000.00 bond issue would produce but $40,202,000.00 in net proceeds. The Port has a surplus of about $19,000,000.00, of which approximately $15,000,000.00 is available for capital projects. The Controller says $49,254,660.00, would thus be available for capital projects costing $41,610,000.00.

The Port is borrowing $7,644,660.00 more than is needed for these seven capital projects. Why? The Port admits it has no long-term written commitments for Piers 80, 94 and 96 which account for $37,570,000.00 of the total bond issue. How can we be assured that the bondholders will be repaid by revenues from those piers if there are no-long term commitments?

Moreover, the Port hasn’t even secured written “letter agreements” from corporations to assure that if those improvements are made, they will sign long-term commitments. Ironically, but $4,000,000.00 of the bond issue would be spent on needed improvements for Fisherman’s Wharf tenants, who generate almost 50% of net Port income, money which would be used to repay the money borrowed for Piers 80, 94 and 96. It’s like the tail wagging the dog.

Selling bonds is nothing more than borrowing money. Why borrow more money than you have to, and why borrow money for projects which don’t have long-term tenants? Be assured that even if this passes, I intend to persist in making Port officials answer these very questions.

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

MOTION AUTHORIZING PROPOSITION A

MOTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE PORT COMMISSION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF CERTAIN PORT FACILITIES TO BE LOCATED AT THE PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 6, 1984 a measure authorizing the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco to issue revenue bonds, all as set forth in the following measure, to wit:

Shall the Port Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in an amount not to exceed $42,500,000 the proceeds of which will be used to modernize container handling facilities and to upgrade various other maritime-oriented facilities at the Port of San Francisco’s piers 35, 80, 94 and 96 and at the Jefferson Street seawall, to construct a breakwater at Fisherman’s Wharf, to construct an intermodal container transfer facility, to install a backflow prevention system at various locations, to replace various transformers and capacitors throughout the port, and to acquire, construct or renovate certain works, property or structures necessary or convenient for the operation of, and at, the Port of San Francisco, which facilities are operated by the Port Commission?

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

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
Water Revenue Bonds

PROPOSITION B

Shall the Public Utilities Commission be authorized to issue $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance acquisition and construction of facilities for the operation of the Water Department?

YES 256

NO 257

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission operates the San Francisco Water Department. When the Commission needs funds to acquire, improve or develop Water Department facilities, it may issue revenue bonds to raise the funds. Before the Commission can issue revenue bonds, a majority of the voters must approve. The revenue bonds are then paid from Water Department revenues.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds. Funds from the sale of the bonds would be used to acquire, improve or develop facilities necessary for the operation of the Water Department, including filtration plants and reservoirs. The bonds would be paid off from the revenues of the Water Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Public Utilities Commission to issue up to $104,000,000 in revenue bonds to finance Water Department improvements.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Public Utilities Commission to issue revenue bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

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

| Bond redemption  | $104,000,000 |
| Bond interest    | 169,260,000  |
| Total debt service requirement | $273,260,000 |

“Based on a five year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning one year after the sale of each issue, the estimated amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would range from approximately $3,467,000 to a maximum of $14,022,000 annually for thirty-one years.

“In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Water Department revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco, provided that there are sufficient revenues from Water Department sources to cover operating and all debt service costs of the Water Department. Analysis of projected resources available to the Water Department indicates that, in my judgment, sufficient revenues will be available to provide debt service costs in future years.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on a resolution placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION B APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The money from these bonds will be used to assure that drinking water we take from our Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs on the Peninsula is pure and meets all health standards. The bonds will be repaid from revenues of our Water Department. Not a penny will be charged on the property tax rolls or to the general taxpayers.

We have two huge lakes alongside I-280 on the Peninsula, the Crystal Springs and San Andreas reservoirs. About 15% of our drinking water in normal times comes from these lakes and others in Alameda County. For decades we used this water without filtration. Now, however, health officials tell us that all of the water from our Peninsula lakes must be filtered before it can be used. We now have a very limited filtering capacity which means that if, for any reason, our water supply from the Sierras were interrupted or reduced and we would need more local water, we would be unable to make full use of Crystal Springs water. There now is no filter plant at Crystal Springs. Whatever water we use from there must be pumped up to a small filtration plant at San Andreas before it can enter the system. This very severely limits the amount of drinking water we can draw from our nearest supply, and it is expensive. Passage of Proposition B would change all that.

By voting YES on B, you will provide for water system improvements including a new filtration plant right at Crystal Springs, for the expansion of the small plant at San Andreas, and for a necessary storage reservoir.

Your YES on B vote is an investment in the quality of our drinking water—an assurance that water from our nearest supply will be available to us pure, meeting all health requirements, when we need it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote YES on Proposition B.

Generations ago, San Franciscans had the foresight to build one of the most magnificent water systems in the world—Hetch Hetchy, which brings water to San Francisco from the High Sierras.

Now, we must modernize the system to keep pace with higher standards of water quality.

Proposition B will authorize the San Francisco Water Department to issue $104 million in revenue bonds.

The money will be used to improve the system by expanding existing plants and by building additional filtration, treatment and holding facilities on Water Department properties on the Peninsula.

These facilities will provide safe drinking water for future generations of San Franciscans. Presently, if any of the existing facilities suffered a breakdown, the City could be forced to rely upon unfiltered water from Crystal Springs. The State Department of Public Health has directed the Water Department to upgrade facilities to meet future needs.

Our water is safe. It meets all state and Federal quality standards, and we want to keep it that way. Proposition B will assure low turbidity (silt content), reduce asbestos content, and prevent the spread of giardia lamblia, a virus not now found in our water system, but which could be brought in as watershed areas become more populated.

Proposition B, which will not have any effect on our tax structure, is a prudent investment, protecting our drinking water into the future. Vote YES on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Vote yes on Proposition B and help guarantee us pure, plentiful water.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B WAS SUBMITTED
PROPOSITION C
Shall a Health Commission consisting of seven members appointed by the Mayor be created to manage and control City and County hospitals and all other county health services and appoint a Director of Public Health?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates the county hospitals, such as San Francisco General and Laguna Honda, and all other county public health services. The Department is run by a Public Health Director, who is appointed by the City’s Chief Administrative Officer and who is responsible to the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would create a Health Commission, and place the Department of Public Health under the control of the Commission. The Commission would have seven members, appointed by the Mayor; no more than three members would be doctors, nurses, hospital administrators or other health care professionals. The Commission would appoint a Public Health Director, responsible to the Commission, to administer the Department. The Public Health Director could appoint and remove deputies to help administer the Department.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of a Health Commission appointed by the Mayor, and to be run by a Public Health Director, appointed by the Health Commission.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the San Francisco Department of Public Health to be under the control of the Chief Administrative Officer and to be run by a Public Health Director appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs of the Health Department, by approximately $8,400 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 82.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Public Health Department has a budget of over $270 million and a staff of 5000, making it the largest agency in City government. Its responsibilities are many and far-reaching: San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital; emergency medical services; mental health services; sanitation; public health education; district health centers; inspection of public and private facilities. The list is long and growing.

In recent years, the list of problems facing departmental administrators has, unfortunately, also grown. Emergency Aid stations were closed. Ambulance service was drastically altered. Proposals to reorganize community mental health services were promoted and rejected, causing confusion for all. The AIDS crisis. The investigations at San Francisco General Hospital. And on and on.

Too often, these decisions and these issues were considered in a vacuum, without public input, without public debate, and without public scrutiny.

Why? In order to protect the Department of Public Health from the graft and corruption that plagued our City at the turn of the century, the Charter placed the department under the Chief Administrative Officer’s auspices rather than a commission. Fifty years later, the department has outgrown this cumbersome arrangement. It is time to bring the administration of this important agency into the 20th Century, mirroring the management of other City departments.

Proposition C will establish a seven-member Health Commission, appointed by the Mayor, to set policy and supervise the Public Health Department. The commission will include both providers and consumers of health services. It will bring the Department more directly under the Mayor’s control, allowing for more timely responses to issues and problems. Most importantly, it will ensure that the department is publicly accountable for its actions.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Public health policy has changed and the governance of our public health department must change too.

In the past few years the state and federal governments have shifted more and more of the responsibility for public health management to local governments.

Recent experience shows that our health department is not presently equipped to manage public health programs in the most effective manner.

Proposition C will streamline management—cutting two levels of bureaucracy while opening up our public health policy to the public itself.

I urge a “yes” vote on Proposition C.

Assemblyman Art Agnos

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Since 1971, the Department of Public Health has been plagued with problems and crises at its hospitals, clinics and emergency aid stations. Most recently, we again faced the threat of San Francisco General losing its accreditation. These many incidents are deeply disturbing, raising troubling questions in the public mind: Why do these problems persist? Why can’t something be done about them once and for all?

In 1979, the national organization that accredits all hospitals reported that San Francisco General’s “major problems . . . are related to the lack of an effective governing body free from the political decision-making process which results in delayed activity, inadequate funding, etc.” Last January, the State auditors also cited the absence of “a governing body legally responsible for hospital governance” as a cause for “ineffective management.”

No other hospital in California operates without a board of directors. Only one other department in San Francisco (Public Works) operates without a commission. Instead, San Francisco General and the Health Department are run by a bureaucracy, insulated from public accountability.

Proposition C establishes a commission for the Health Department, one that will hold public hearing, make public decisions, and be publicly accountable. Vote YES.

Assemblyman Art Agnos
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Supervisor Louise Renne

Supervisor Bill Maher
Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Doris Ward

Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

(Continued)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's population is aging. In a few short years, a greater percentage of our citizens will be seniors—most living independently on fixed incomes, many frail and over 75—than those of other California cities. They will need nutritional information, home health care, and a broad range of coordinated social services.

The Department of Health, San Francisco General, Laguna Honda, the District Health Centers—these are critical providers of senior services. And as more and more state and federal programs are shifted to local agencies, the Department's role and responsibilities will dramatically increase.

How will the Department respond to this increased responsibility? How can we ensure that it will develop policies and programs that meet seniors' needs? And how can we be sure that these programs operate efficiently and effectively?

Proposition C is a big step in the right direction. VOTE YES!

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C is important for women.

Women provide the majority of services offered by the Health Department. Indeed public health is traditionally the domain of women and nurses. And while the many crises at General are too often blamed on nursing care, nurses virtually have no role in planning or organizing service delivery.

Women are also the major consumers of the Department's services. As more and more block grants transfer health programs from the state and federal levels to local governments, the Department will become an increasingly important provider to women.

Proposition C gives women an opportunity to make their voices heard at the highest levels of the Health Department. And our voices must be heard if services are to be organized efficiently and responsibly.

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

The policies governing San Francisco General affect every consumer and provider of health services in the City, yet there is little accountability to San Francisco taxpayers. No private hospital with General's size and influence operates without a board of trustees or directors. Indeed, no private organization of any kind with a $270 million annual budget—business, corporation, nonprofit foundation, whatever—operates without a governing board. Why does General?

As General bounces from one crisis to the next, with state and federal agencies threatening increasingly drastic actions, the weakness of the current management structure becomes clear to all. The Hospital and the Health Department need a commission, where public hearings can surface problems and issues in a timely fashion; where policies can be developed with the cooperation of private providers and consumers. The Health Commission will not be a watchdog meddling in day-to-day affairs, but an advocate for General, one providing continuity, stability and a rational decision-making process with regular rules and procedures.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition C.

Rolland Lowe, M.D.
Past President, San Francisco Medical Society
Robert Aaron, M.D.
Robert Gross, M.D.
Molly Coye, M.D.
Robert Koshiyama, D.D.S.
Maureen Katz, M.D.
Yoshio Nakashima, D.D.S.

James Cole, M.D.
John Good, M.D.
Jeff Sandler, M.D.
Judy Keeven, M.D.
Robert Dickter, D.D.S.
Jeffrey Draisin, M.D.
Gabriel Escobar, M.D.
Brad Evans, M.D.

Lars Erickson, M.D.
Randy Yanda, M.D.
Stephen Collins, M.D.
Lewis Pepper, M.D.
Mark Smith, M.D.
Donald Goldmacher, M.D.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is obligated to ensure that all San Francisco communities have access to medical services. The AIDS crisis brought the health care needs of gay men to the forefront of public discussion. It brought home the importance of a Department flexible and responsive to quickly emerging problems and epidemics, one capable of quickly reallocating resources to dire community needs.

The general health needs of gay men and women, however, are largely unrecognized. The Health Commission will give our community the voice it needs in the health planning processes. It will ensure that the diversity of our City is represented in the consideration of these important issues.

Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Sal Rosselli
John Mehring
Del Martin
Donald Cataland
Cleve Jones
Randall Stallings

Ralph Huberman
Richard Allman
Jeff Jones
Phyllis Lyon
Debra Friedland

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Hispanics in San Francisco strongly support Proposition C, the Health Commission Charter Amendment.

Health is vital to the Latino Community of San Francisco. We are a younger population, with larger families and with special health needs, such as those of Central American refugees. In recent years, federal and state funding for health programs has decreased, leaving community health programs in a difficult financial situation. Recent changes in Medically Indigent Adult services have also negatively impacted our community.

In addition, the need for better and expanded bilingual medical services continues to be a top priority in San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition C.

Celso Ortiz
Rafael Cedillo
Maria Degado
Roberto Hernandez
Joanna Devito-Larson
Rosa Maria Clos
Susan Houston
Amell Rodrigues
P. Braverman, M.D.
Alfredo Rodrigues
Sonia Melara
Joseph Tanner
Edgar Quiroz
Angel Couturas

Roger Hernandez
Tom Romero
Raphael Taliaferro
Juanita Del Carlo
Juan Pifarre
Rudolph Mathias
Rolph Hurtado
Alfredo Rivas
Vilma Mondoza
O. Bracker
Ray Rivera
Lorenzo Dill
Yolanda Cameros

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

The chief opposition to Proposition C comes from two sources: The Chief Administrative Officer and the officials of the University of California Medical Center.

The CAO's opposition is understandable. He simply doesn't want to lose control of the Health Department and SF General.

UC's opposition is more puzzling, until you realize that it receives $10–15 million from the City each year for staffing at General Hospital without a publicly reviewed contract! Why is UC afraid of having its relationship with General publicly scrutinized by a Health Commission?

Let's clear the air. Vote YES on Proposition C.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

We support Proposition C.

Fred Ross
James O'Connor
Dale Carlson
Pamela Duffy
Gerald Youachum
D.J. Soviero
Rosalind Wolf
Gordon Brownell
Jim Wachob
Steven Krefting
Joanne Miller
Maura Kealey
Margaret O'Driscoll
Nicerita Revelo

Beatrice Patterson
Arlo Hale Smith
Dian Blomquist
Thomas Moore
Jack Morrison
Mary Vail
Sally Osaki
Linda Post
Terrance Farr
Ken McEldowney
Sue Hestor
Willie Gee, D.D.S.
Agar Jaicks
John Holtzclaw

Paul Vacaralli
Al Cassiato
Alan Raznick
James Haas
Al Borvice
Essie Webb
Joan Moulton
Russell Zeller
Stanley Shields
Richard Sevilla
Ann Daley
Dorothy Labudde
Dorice Murphy
Howard Strassner
Mark Davalos
Larry Griffin

Jay Wallace
Rob Waters
Kevin Malone
Jan Holloway
Norman Rolfe
Tom Jones
Barbara Halliday
Sandra Powell
Deborah Sarvis
Esther Marks
James Augustino
Sharon Johnson
Eileen Adams
Ruth Gravanis
Michael Heffer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Community clinics provide thousands of San Franciscans with access to essential primary health care and preventive health services. Yet, these community-based institutions, as well as the neighborhoods and people they represent, have been excluded from participation in health policy decision-making in San Francisco. Excluded, too, is any public debate on alternatives to hospital-based health delivery and financing systems that could prove cost-effective and could better serve the people of San Francisco.

Proposition C, The Health Commission Charter Amendment, offers a forum for public discussion of local health policy issues. By giving the neighborhoods and communities input into health policy decisions, the Health Commission will enable San Franciscans to create a new community of interest and new community of action in the area of health service delivery.

VOTE YES on PROPOSITION C.

San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium
Myles Dixon
George Dykstra
Susan Erlich
Patricia Franks
Debra Friedland
Kate Lambert

Mike Pincus
David Smith, M.D.
Marin Waukazoo
Jerome West
Sophie Wong
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Commission will be of vital importance to the Asian community. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Dr. Yoshio Nakashima
Louis Hop Lee
Samuel Chung

David Yamakawa
Ernest Wu
Joe Jung
George Suncin
Sophie Wong
Pattie Fong
Willie Gee, D.D.S.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

The Health Department is a key source of medical services in the black community, both directly through General Hospital and the district health centers, and indirectly through community and mental health clinics.

But our special problems—an infant mortality rate significantly above rates in other Bay Area counties, for example—are not often heard by the Department's policy-makers, for they are insulated and isolated from our community.

Our concerns must be heard if they are to be ad-
dressed. Proposition C gives us a platform from which to speak. Vote YES.

Elouise Westbrook
Yvonne Golden
Lorenzo R. Dill
Zuretti L. Goosby, D.D.S
Julianne Malveaux
Eugene Coleman
Naomi T. Gray

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

This proposal to put politics into the Department of Public Health by creating a "commission" to direct it is an example of the misguided philosophy of attacking governmental problems by throwing bureaucracy at them. It should be soundly defeated. Currently, the City's health officials report to one person, the Chief Administrative Officer, who can respond swiftly to any crisis and set consistent policy. The responsibility for the Department lies with the CAO, not a group of political appointees. When our Charter was adopted in 1932, the freeholders explained the rationale of giving the CAO management responsibility over the Health Department. The idea was "to provide reasonable safeguards AGAINST POLITICAL MANIPULATION." (Emphasis added) Their report stated the office of CAO was designed to be "protected from political influence as largely as possible . . ." and "it is intended that this officer shall be entirely independent in discharging the function of the office, and particularly, to be free from interference of the mayor, because the latter is subjected to political influence." Although the Charter was adopted in 1932, its logic still makes powerful sense. Besides blurring lines of responsibility, this iniquitous proposal contradicts health management practices in California and the United States. In fact, the same idea was evaluated in 1971 by a committee established by the supervisors, which concluded that the commission concept, a "seemingly attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another bureaucratic layer in an already cluttered city administrative structure." To paraphrase The Progress, the Muni is the best proof that "the presence of a commission does not guarantee good management." Vote NO on Proposition C.

Supervisor 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.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

The enactment of Proposition C would set the clock back on health care delivery in San Francisco to the 1920s. As proposed, the measure would almost exactly duplicate the system of Health Care abandoned by The City in 1932 because it had become corrupt, politicized and incapable of effectively responding to the growing challenges of modern health care administration.

In 1973 the Board of Supervisors itself considered and rejected a similar Health Commission option. The board's reason was that commissions do not make effective management tools. "The Commission, seemingly an attractive alternative at first blush, would likely constitute merely another layer in an already cluttered City administrative structure."

The commission concept also goes counter to sound health management practices. Earlier this year, a team of top Bay Area health care professionals was asked to identify the leading municipal hospitals in the country. None of the institutions identified uses a commission form of administration largely because commissions, while perhaps capable of overseeing some urban systems such as mass transit, have proven ineffective and cumbersome.

The argument has been advanced that a commission would allow for greater citizen input into the health department. The fact is that the Department of Health already has some 440 individuals serving on 27 Citizen Advisory Committees—more than with any other city department. The proposed seven member commission would be insufficient in both size and technical competence to do other than deal with the health care in San Francisco on a "crisis-to-crisis" basis.

As we move into the 21st Century, the administration of San Francisco's health care systems will only become more challenging. A form of governance that proved inadequate 50 years ago and was rejected by the Board of Supervisors eleven years ago as inappropriate, is not the best way to provide for our city's health care needs of the future. We urge you to vote "No" on Proposition C.

Dr. Frank Lewis, Chief of Staff, San Francisco General Hospital
Walter Newman, Overseer, UCSF
Yori Wada, UC Board of Regents
Dr. Frank Curry, Former Director of Public Health
Dr. Frank Sooy, Chancellor Emeritus, UCSF
Virginia Leishman, Director of Nursing, Laguna Honda Hospital

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

A vote for Proposition C is a vote to politicize health care in San Francisco. The authors of the 1932 City Charter foresaw this when they abolished the city's highly politicized seven member health commission and placed the Department of Health under the jurisdiction of the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition C would return San Francisco to the pre-1932 system of politicized health care management.

In writing the 1932 Charter, the authors recognized the need to balance executive authority by splitting it between the Mayor and the CAO. Departments, such as health, which were thought to be best managed if protected from direct political influence, were placed under the jurisdiction of the CAO, who is appointed for a fixed 10 year term to remove the office from political pressure.

Despite the occurrence of problems the system has worked well. San Francisco General has perhaps the best Trauma Unit in the country. The hospital's AIDS unit is unquestionably the best and most humane in the nation.

Moving control of the city's health care budget from the Chief Administrative Officer to the Executive will create a "strong mayor" type of government which the Charter was designed to prevent. Health commissioners would necessarily be beholden to the political factions or individuals which lobbied for their appointment and to the mayor who appoints them.

There are alternatives to a Health Commission. Several have already been recommended by a blue ribbon panel of health management experts appointed following the report on General Hospital. We believe these recommendations and perhaps others, including a variation on the health commission concept, deserve further study.

Proposition C would bring about a radical restructuring of government and health care delivery in San Francisco. Both issues are far too important to be decided hastily. We urge a No vote on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Wendy Nelder, President, Board of Supervisors
Florette White Pomeroy, Consultant
William K. Coblenz, Attorney
Thomas E. Horn, VP, Board of Trustees, War Memorial
J. Gary Shansby, Chairman of the Board, Shaklee Corporation
Eugene Friend, President, Recreation and Park Commission

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

I oppose Proposition C because:
1. It puts the Health Department under the control of politically appointed non-professionals. I cannot agree that this should be done. It brings in politics and throws out expertise.
2. It adds an extra layer of bureaucracy making government more expensive and management more difficult.

 Supervisor Richard Hongisto

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Your City Hall representatives would have you believe that by replacing our present Health System with a Health Commission, composed of seven members, at a recompense of $100 per month, will improve the services. Hogwash. Just another layer of government.

With a budget of $270 millions, 5000 employees would you put your faith in the hands of seven and still maintain the same Health Director?

What we need is a clean sweep of the present management; new faces; new ideas. The Charter provides for this, let's do it—"Now," not later.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION C

Marguerite A. Warren

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

By creating a health commission for the Public Health Department, the city of San Francisco would create more problems rather than solve them.

Past experience has indicated a need to separate politics from health care. San Francisco would be turning the clock back to a situation in the 1920s when the city had a seven-member commission appointed by the Mayor that oversaw the management of the Public Health Department. The delivery of effective health care was seriously compromised by the politicized department which was a direct consequence of the department's health commission.

For this reason, the citizens of San Francisco at that time passed a charter reform that removed the Health Department from the politically appointed commission and placed it in a newly created Chief Administrative Officer who would be secured against political pressures.

The creation of the Health Commission would take 40% of the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer's budget and place it under the control of a politically appointed Commission, thus negating the intent of the Chief Administrative Officer's Department which was created to administer departments that should be removed from political concerns.

Do not politicize San Francisco's health care. Vote No on Proposition C.

John H. Jacobs  
Executive Director  
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT  
PROPOSITION C

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, and County Agricultural Department; Health Advisory Board; 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.

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

(Continued on page 82)
PROPOSITION D
Shall the Retirement Board be authorized to make investments of retirement funds as a prudent person instead of investments legal for insurance companies?  YES 261  NO 262

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement Board has complete authority to invest the funds of the Retirement System for city employees. The Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would remove the requirement that the Retirement Board must make only investments which are legal for insurance companies in California. Instead, the proposition would require the Retirement Board to make investments with the care and skill that a prudent person would make under similar circumstances.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the way the Retirement Board invests pension money. Instead of making only those investments which are legal for insurance companies, the Board would be able to make any investments that a prudent person would make.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to keep making only the same kind of investments which are legal for insurance companies.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-5 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, Bill Maher, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.


Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not, in and of itself, increase the cost of government. However, as a result of its authorizing additional flexibility for investments, earnings may be higher or lower than what could have occurred absent this amendment.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION D APPEARS ON PAGE 63.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Vote YES on Proposition D.
The purpose of Proposition D is to clarify the investment responsibility of the Retirement Board and to add language expressly to comply with the recently enacted State Constitutional amendment on fiduciary standards for public pension plans (Proposition 21, June 1984).

Since 1932, the charter has referred to the Insurance Code as the guideline for pension investments.

Insurance Code investment requirements are unsuitable to current pension fund investment practices and severely restrict the ability of the Retirement Board to manage the fund to achieve the best possible investment return for the City and County of San Francisco and the members of the Retirement System.

The added new language will establish firm guidelines for the Retirement Board to discharge its responsibility as the fiduciary for the Retirement Fund. This new language will also serve as increased protection for members of the Retirement System by applying recognized fiduciary standards for which there is considerable statutory and case law.

In summary, the proposed charter amendment serves a dual purpose: it removes obsolete and ambiguous language and brings the Retirement System into compliance with the State Constitution. Both changes will enhance and improve the System’s investment capabilities and the ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

Proposition D is endorsed and supported by the Retirement Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition D.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This is a worthwhile Charter amendment which updates obsolete and ambiguous provisions on how the Retirement Board can invest funds. It institutes standards consistent with a recent voter-approved amendment to the California Constitution. Investment practices have been refined dramatically in the past 50 years, and income and appreciation choices have increased tremendously. The investment professionals working for the Retirement System now are prevented from making the very most prudent investments possible, and City employees and taxpayers are, thus, prejudiced and hurt.

Present investment rules are based upon the State Insurance Code, which contravenes contemporary investment practices. Proposition D will give more latitude in making high-return investments, but will also retain vigorous guidelines on investment of Retirement System funds while increasing the protection of City employees. It will save money for taxpayers by enabling a better return on Retirement System assets. It’s logical. That’s why I recommend a “yes” vote.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties
The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive, and may continue to receive, benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established. Provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California.

The retirement board shall discharge its duties with respect to the system with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiar with these matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims.

USE YOUR VOTER SELECTION CARD WHEN VOTING (see insert)
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) ________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ________________________________

Signature ______________________________________________
Surviving Spouse Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City subsidize the surviving spouse of active retired employees on the same basis that the City subsidizes the active or retired employees in the health service system?

YES 264

NO 265

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would provide that the City contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for a least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the health care fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the health care fund for the surviving spouse of a deceased employee.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On July 23 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Bill Maher.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government, based on current costs and present membership data of the Health Service System, in excess of $990,000 per year."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 67.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

This charter amendment calls for extending a limited measure of aid from the City and County of San Francisco for the health care of the surviving spouse of an active or retired City employee.

Under existing statute, the City and County and its employees, active or retired, share the cost of health care for the employee, their spouse and children. However, upon the death of the employee, the City and County’s share of payments to the health care system stops.

Thus, the surviving spouse is compelled to pick up the entire cost for the health care plan while struggling to survive on a reduced family income and, at the same time, contend with ever increasing medical/hospital expenses and everyday living costs for themselves and eligible family dependents.

Proposition E will allow the City and County to continue paying its share into the health care system and not force the surviving spouse and eligible family dependents to assume the entire financial burden for health care payments.

Since the number of surviving spouses affected is very small, less than 1400, the cost to the taxpayer for the City and County is minimal.

The changes proposed by Proposition E should have been made many years ago; it is long overdue. We urge you to support this important measure.

Vote YES on Proposition E.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Justice tempered with compassion. VOTE YES. Surviving spouses of City workers receive an automatic 50% cut in retirement pay upon the death of their partners. Why further burden this small group by withdrawing subsidy for health care?

The Retirement System actuary has officially confirmed that the average pension check for this group is $300.00 per month; incidentally, below the nationally quoted poverty level.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by William T. Reed, Chairman Legislative Committee, Retired Employees City & County of San Francisco Helen McAtee, Chairperson Philip Kearney, President, and retired manager of the Health Service

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

The Health Service Board which administers the health benefits provided to active and retired employees and their dependents fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the surviving spouse upon the death of a retired employee.

This financial problem is especially acute because a surviving spouse's pension is cut by 50% at the death of the employee and because of the high cost of medical insurance. Medical cost increases have outpaced general inflation rates over the last three (3) years by about two to one.

We urge your “YES” vote on Proposition “E” on the basis of need and equity.

Abraham Bernstein, M.D., President Health Service Board of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Surviving spouses of city employees need this for a relatively comfortable widowhood. Let’s extend a small measure of consideration to those who are left on their own.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

NOTE: YOUR POLLING PLACE MAY HAVE CHANGED. PLEASE REFER TO MAILING LABEL ON BACK COVER.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Proposition E if approved would require the city to subsidize the health premiums of the surviving spouses of non-uniformed city employees. The cost to the city would amount to $990,000 per year and give city employees a benefit that is not normally enjoyed by workers in private industry.

The majority of private employees have health plans that allow surviving spouses to be members of such plans but the employer does not subsidize the premiums of these survivors in anyway. Being permitted to join a group plan that provides comprehensive coverage at a reasonable rate is a sufficient benefit in and of itself.

If this amendment is approved it will violate the spirit of the Charter provision that sets city employee salaries and benefits at the average of that which prevails in the metropolitan Bay Area. We believe in fair treatment and compensation for city employees and our current rules provide exactly that.

Vote No on Proposition E.

John H. Jacobs
Executive Director
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARter AMENDMENT PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by *bold face* type; deletions are indicated by *strikeout* type.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of members and retired persons of the parking authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition referred to submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972 and 1984 shall be effective July 1, 1973 1985.

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

PROPOSITION F

Shall a death benefit of twelve months salary be paid to miscellaneous officers and employees who die from an external and violent bodily injury in the course and scope of employment?  

YES 267 ▼
NO 268 ▼

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, who is a member of the Retirement System is entitled to a death benefit of six months salary if he or she dies, regardless of cause, before retirement. The benefit is paid to the employee's estate or designated beneficiary.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would provide that if an officer or employee, other than a police officer or firefighter, is injured through external and violent means in the course of employment and the employee dies within 180 days of the injury, an additional benefit of 12 months salary would be paid to the employee's estate or designated beneficiary.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to pay an additional benefit of 12 months salary to a city employee who dies from an injury caused by external and violent means in the course of employment.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to provide an additional death benefit to these city employees who die from external and violent means in the course of employment.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which is dependent upon the number of employees and their respective salary rates which qualify for payment under the provisions of this proposed amendment. Based on experience to date, the cost of this additional amount should not be substantial."
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F provides a small compensation for the survivor of a city employee (non Police or Fire) killed in the line of duty. Let’s agree to this minor expenditure for the survivors of those who have died in city service.

Richard Hongisto, Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Only rarely is a city employee killed in the line of duty, but death can come with fierce suddenness.

Two Muni workers were crushed by cable car machinery in 1978; the following year, two Water Department employees were murdered at the Lake Merced Pumping Station; and in March 1981, a Hetch Hetchy lineman fell to his death.

For the families of the vast majority of city workers, there is little protection when death comes. Police officers and fire fighters already have special death benefits.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Proposition F is designed to correct a serious inequity on behalf of miscellaneous members of the Retirement System who are killed in line of duty or who die as a result of a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury.

Under current charter provisions, a designated beneficiary of a member who dies in the course of employment from any cause receives the member’s contributions to the system, plus six months’ salary.

Proposition F focuses only on those members who are killed in the line of duty or who die within 180 days from a violent or traumatic job-incurred injury. Benefitaries of such members will be accorded an additional insurance benefit of twelve months’ salary.

The payment of additional compensation to a designated beneficiary will be subject to the independent hearing officer process as set forth in the City charter.

Proposition F is fair and equitable and, based on actuarial projections, the cost is minimal.

Proposition F is sponsored and endorsed by the Retirement Board, unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, and strongly supported by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Vote YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION F

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

8.509 Retirement—Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

A(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

(Continued on page 84)
Police Probationary Period

PROPOSITION G

Shall the probationary period for police officers be extended from one-year from entry to one year after completion of training but not to exceed eighty-four weeks?  

YES 270  
NO 271  

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Police officers entering the Police Department serve a one-year probationary period. During the first 32 weeks, the police officer goes through the police training program. After successfully completing training, the officer is then assigned to regular police duties. The Police Department has 20 weeks to evaluate the officer while on regular police duty. After this 20 week period, the probation is complete.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would extend the probationary period of the police officer to one year after the completion of the training. In no event would it extend the probationary period beyond 84 weeks from the date of entry. Any termination for breach of duty or misconduct would require charges and a hearing before the Police Commission.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the probationary period for a police officer to be extended to one year after completing the police training course but not to exceed 84 weeks.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the probationary period for a police officer to remain one year after the date of entry into the department.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted "No."

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Your YES vote for this amendment will enable the Police Department to provide more effective police services by ensuring that after officers graduate from the Academy and complete a field training program, an adequate probationary evaluation period exists to determine an officer's fitness to perform police duties. Society demands much from its police officers. As the nature of police work has become increasingly complex, training and performance evaluation functions must meet the needs of an ever-evolving profession.

Great expenditure of time and money are invested in training police officers. Presently, if a recruit is not deemed ready for duty, the probationary period can be completed during any retraining, thus making it difficult and costly to determine ultimate fitness for duty.

By voting YES, you will give the Chief of Police time necessary to adequately train and evaluate an officer's performance and to better ensure quality police services.

The Police Department has met and conferred with the Police Officers' Association regarding this amendment and has obtained that organization's support for its passage.

Vote YES on Proposition G.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The Police Chief asked for a longer probationary period because it is needed. Vote yes.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

I urge you to vote YES on Proposition G.

In recent years, because San Francisco has had the financial strength to do so, we've steadily expanded the size of the Police Department.

It is now the largest ever, with 1987 officers.

More and more officers are being assigned to our neighborhoods on beats and in patrolcars. We want the best officers possible.

That's why Proposition G is so important. It will give the Department greater ability to screen out officers who do not measure up to the strict standards of professionalism this city demands.

Proposition G will extend the probation period for a new officer to one complete year following completion of his or her field training.

Presently, probation starts when an officer is first inducted into the Department, before 18 weeks of class work in the City's outstanding Police Academy and another 14 weeks of field training.

As strenuous as the class work and the training may be, the real test of an officer is on the street.

That's where his or her coolness, competence and compassion—in fact, all the qualities that this city wants in a superior police department—can be observed and tested.

Proposition G will give the department a full year to evaluate an officer in uniform and on the job.

Those who don't measure up can be dismissed after a departmental hearing. Protected will be the City's rightful concern that our police officers can truly be described as the City's finest.

Proposition G is a common-sense measure, sought by the Chief of Police, that will strengthen the San Francisco Police Department. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

This is probably the most important proposition on this Fall's ballot, a common sense measure. It deals with the Police Department, which has the ultimate responsibility for the protection of persons and property in our community. It increases the probationary period of police officers by one year. It is intended to ensure that the men and women who protect us are of the highest quality possible. Right now, police officers actually have only a four month probationary period. That's because they spend over 12 months probation in class and training, and only four months on the streets and on the job.

Police commanders need more time to evaluate the recruits' "street" performance. Proposition G does that by extending the on-the-job probationary period up to one year. For the sake of our children, neighbors and all San Franciscans, I want to be sure that a police officer is fully competent from a practical standpoint, not merely because of a classroom perspective. Therefore, I support Proposition G, and I urge you to vote for it, too.

Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisor
Police Motorcycle Pay

PROPOSITION H

Shall additional rates of pay be paid to members of the Police Department assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle duty based on the average paid in California cities of 350,000 and over population?

YES 274
NO 275

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and who are assigned to the Traffic Division get bonus pay. Police officers who ride motorcycles as part of their job, but who are assigned to duties other than traffic, do not get bonus pay.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would give all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want all San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job to get the same bonus pay, whether or not they are assigned to the Traffic Division.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want only those San Francisco police officers who ride two-wheel motorcycles as part of their job and are assigned to the Traffic Division to get bonus pay.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors voted “No.”

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current rates of pay, staffing and assignments by the police department, the cost of government would be increased by approximately $74,000 per year.”

THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION H APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The Honda Motorcycle Unit of the San Francisco Police Department has, because of antiquated charter language, been denied payment of the hazard pay which is currently given to the two-wheel motorcycle officers in the Traffic Division.

Because the primary function of the Honda Motorcycle Unit is crime fighting and not traffic enforcement, the word “traffic” must be deleted from the charter in order to compensate equally all officers who perform hazardous motorcycle duty.

Please join us in voting YES for this very fair charter amendment.

Submitted by Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

In 1970, the San Francisco Police Department created a unit of light weight motorcycles to patrol Golden Gate Park and the beaches surrounding the City. In 1977 these duties were drastically changed to counteract rising street crimes around the Western Addition. Neighborhood associations, seeing the effectiveness of the unit, also requested additional patrols by these motorcycle officers. Since 1977 the Honda Unit (as it is known now) has been assigned to virtually every neighborhood in the City to reduce purse snatches, “red light” robberies, drag racing, and street narcotics traffic, along with demonstrations, marches, parades, and sporting events all over the City.

Also occurring since 1977 have been injuries to these highly visible, highly vulnerable motorcycle officers. Some of these injuries include one officer hit head on, and another officer suffering a leg broken by an auto which ran a red light. There have been numerous officers struck by other vehicles causing injuries, and injuries due to other road hazards (oil slicks, pothole etc.). These have increased sharply since the Honda Unit has been assigned to primarily street patrol. One officer was shot twice while patrolling the Western Addition for purse snatches.

It is obvious that these officers are no longer “just” patrolling the parks and beaches as they were initially intended, but are now assigned to patrol the streets of the most crime-ridden areas of the City combating street crimes and enforcing traffic laws. These officers on prior occasions have requested Motorcycle Hazard Pay (which traffic enforcement two-wheel motorcycle officers already receive) for their patrol of these neighborhoods and streets on the two-wheel motorcycles but have been denied because of outdated wording in the Charter. Passage of this amendment would correct this inequity.

Al Cusciato
President, S.F.P.O.A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

All police officers who ride motorcycles in the course of duty face special danger and deserve the premium pay already allowed for motorcycle traffic officers.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

A police officer on a two-wheeler is often the first on the scene of a major crime or emergency. Day after day, there is no more hazardous duty for our police.

Whether on a motorcycle in pursuit of a felon on city streets, or on a motorbike on patrol in the remote areas of the City’s parklands, an officer lives with danger. Because they can cut through traffic, the two-wheelers often are first to arrive at a shooting or bank robbery or car crash.

The City Charter has long recognized the dangers inherent in this essential police work and has provided hazard-pay for motorcycle officers of the Traffic Division. Proposition H simply extends hazard-pay to the 17 or so officers on the equally-perilous motorbike detail.

The amount of money involved is small—only $178 a month for each officer. Proposition H is small recognition of the dangers the police daily face in the line of duty. Vote YES on Proposition H.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Military & Social Spending Initiative

PROPOSITION I

(Initiative Ordinance): Shall San Francisco request that the federal government question all taxpayers whether they wish any part of their taxes used for excessive military spending and have the City publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco and the portions used for excessive military purposes and for social needs?

YES 278

NO 279

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco does not have an official position on whether federal taxes should be used for certain kinds of defense spending.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I says the Board of Supervisors must inform the President and certain other federal officials that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether they want their tax dollars used for certain kinds of “excessive military expenditures”, as defined in the measure. Proposition I also says the City’s Chief Administrative Officer must publish an annual report on the amount of federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents, what portion of these taxes are used for military spending, and what portion are used for social or human needs. The Board of Supervisors would appoint a seven-member Citizens’ Advisory Committee to oversee the preparation of the report.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you think federal officials should be told that the people of San Francisco think all taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending. You also want the City to publish an annual report on how federal tax dollars collected from San Francisco residents are spent.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you don’t think taxpayers should be asked whether their tax dollars should be used for certain kinds of defense spending, and you don’t want the City to publish an annual report on federal taxes collected from San Francisco residents.

How “I” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition relating to military and social expenditures had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The proponents of the petition had gathered 12,271 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 2. The proponents are officially listed as G.C. Barnes, L.J. Crowe, H.J. Hobi and R.A. Wall.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,304 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative ordinance for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“Should the proposed initiative ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time but should not be substantial.”

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I APPEARS ON PAGE 75.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

This initiative should be passed because it educates people about excessive military spending and sends a clear message to the Federal Government that people want a choice as to how their taxes are spent.

Homer Hobi
Chairperson
The Humanist Party

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why waste taxpayers' money for a handful of misguided individuals?

City government is mandated to govern local citizens affairs.

Martin Eng
School Board Candidate

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPPOSITION I

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following terms are defined:

(a) Excessive military expenditures: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is destined for research, development, and production of nuclear weapons; research, development, and production of outer space laser-beam technology weapons (popularly known as "star-war" weapons); military aid, both overt and covert, to undemocratic and/or repressive governments (governments that violate the basic human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted in 1948 by the United Nations);

(b) Social or human needs: any part of the federal budget from any agency or department that is used for education, housing, health and human services, public transportation, and the arts.

(c) San Francisco taxpayer: any individual who pays federal taxes and who reports his or her principal place of residence within the San Francisco city limits; and any corporation who is considered by the Internal Revenue Service as residing in San Francisco.

Section 2. The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco shall notify the President of the United States, the Vice-President, all members of the President's Cabinet, and all members of Congress that it is the policy of the people of San Francisco to call on the Federal Government to ask all federal taxpayers, at the time they report their federal taxes, whether they wish that any part of their tax contribution be used for excessive military expenditures. This policy shall also be published for the people of San Francisco in major city newspapers.

Section 3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall be responsible for the publication of an annual report citing the amount of federal tax monies collected from San Francisco taxpayers. This annual report shall include the following amounts:

(a) Total federal tax revenues contributed by all San Francisco taxpayers;

(b) Portion of the revenues in 3(a) budgeted for any type of military expenditures;

(c) Portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for military expenditures;

(d) Portion of revenues in 3(a) budgeted for social or human needs;

(e) Average individual tax contribution;

(f) Average individual tax contribution allocated to (1) excessive military expenditures and (2) social needs.

The Board of Supervisors shall appoint a Citizens' Advisory Committee every year to oversee the preparation of the report and to ensure that its findings are accurate and impartial. The Citizens' Advisory Committee shall consist of seven members, at least three of whom shall be volunteers from renowned peace organizations in San Francisco.

The report shall use the most current figures available from the federal government at the time of publication, citing the sources for the computations. If the necessary tax and budgetary breakdowns for San Francisco were not available, the report shall base itself upon tax revenue and budgetary figures for the entire nation (or subdivision thereof) and produce accurate extrapolations.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall publish the report in the two newspapers of largest circulation in San Francisco, no earlier than 14 days before but no later than the normal deadline for the filing of federal income taxes for individuals.
South African Investment Policy

PROPOSITION J

(Declaration of Policy): Shall it be the policy of San Francisco that no pension funds administered by the City be invested in business entities that do business in South Africa until apartheid is abolished and black people are given full political and civil rights in South Africa?

YES 283

NO 284

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City and County of San Francisco has no policy about the investment of pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco and its agencies not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa. This would be the official policy until Black people are given full political and civil rights by the government of South Africa.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want it to be the official policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to invest pension funds in corporations or other organizations that do business in South Africa.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and County of San Francisco to have an official policy against investing pension funds with organizations that do business in South Africa.

How “J” Got on Ballot

On August 24 Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition on South African investment policy had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Julianne Malveaux, the official proponent of the petition drive, had gathered 11,404 signatures which she turned in to the Registrar on August 8.

A random check of the petition showed that 8,520 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 7,332 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its application, investment income may be affected in an indeterminate but possibly substantial amount.”

POLLS ARE OPEN FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 P.M.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

We support removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa because we believe the city of San Francisco should not support the reprehensible institution of apartheid. Non-whites in South Africa are denied freedom of association, freedom of mobility, freedom of speech, and voting rights. San Franciscans support this inequality when city pension funds are invested in companies that do business with South Africa.

This investment is also a very risky investment since any civil unrest in South Africa may lower the value of the investment. Other investment possibilities will equal or exceed current yields on the pension portfolio.

We support this initiative because we support equal rights for all, and because we believe in prudent investment of city pension funds.

San Franciscans for Responsible Investments

*Julianne Malveaux, Chair*
*Essie Mornen, Co-Chair*
*Henry Clark, Co-Chair*
*Arlo Hale Smith, Treasurer*

---

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

By supporting Proposition J, San Franciscans join citizens from fourteen other cities, including Washington, D.C., Boston, and Berkeley, in removing city pension funds from companies that do business with South Africa. Our support strikes a blow against the apartheid policy that has denied Black and non-white people equal rights in South Africa.

Removing pension funds from South Africa makes good economic sense. International investment advisors recommend against such investment because of the frailty of the South African political situation. Significantly, none of the cities that have divested funds from South Africa have had lower earnings since divestment.

It is both morally just and fiscally sound to vote YES for Proposition J!

*Julianne Malveaux, Ph.D.*
*Assistant Professor, Economics*
*S.F. State University*
*Candidate for Supervisor*

---

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud that we were the first state in the nation to vote to sell from our public pension fund portfolio all investments in firms doing business in South Africa. Since the passage of this landmark legislation, it has been our experience that divestiture makes not only a strong moral statement against apartheid, but divestiture has proven to have had no negative impact on our pension earnings.

I urge San Franciscans to give serious consideration to both the moral and the financial arguments as you consider divestiture as a policy of your great city.

*Michael Dukakis*
*Governor, Massachusetts*
*Submitted by John Burke*
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For over a decade individuals and institutional investors, including local and state governments, universities, foundations, churches, Taft-Hartley pension funds and health and welfare plans have refused to invest in, and divested from corporations and financial institutions economically supporting apartheid in South Africa. They are investing and earning competitive returns in housing, small business, alternative energy, and other socially productive investments which create employment and prevent capital from being exported to South Africa.

It is fiduciarily irresponsible to risk beneficiaries' pension assets by investing in companies in South Africa.

Many trade and corporate risk analysts have recommended no investment exposure in South Africa. The Rockefeller Study Commission on U.S. policy toward Southern Africa, recently recommended no new corporate investments in that white, minority ruled country.

Vote to create jobs, housing and small business in your community, not apartheid in South Africa. Vote YES on Proposition J.

John Harrington, President
Working Assets Money Fund

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

"For the sake of the children of all South Africans, black and white, for God's sake, for the sake of world peace, the international community must take action, it must exert pressure on South Africa—political pressure, diplomatic pressure and above all, economic pressure.”
(Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary-South African Council of Churches, 1981)

The apartheid system continues because of Western support. The South African Council of Churches has said “foreign investors must know they are investing to buttress one of the most vicious systems since Nazism.” As members of the international religious community, we can no longer let others make decisions which contradict all that we believe in. We urge San Franciscans to vote yes on Proposition J as a specific, responsible way to express their moral rejection of apartheid.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Rev. Cecil Williams
Dr. Thomas Ambrogii
Dr. Norman Leach
Rev. Glenda Hope
Rev. Jean Richardson
Rev. Robert Cromey
Rev. Stanley Stefancic
Rev. James Claitor
Rev. Pamela White
First Congregational Church
Rev. Kenneth Westray
Rev. Preliono Walker
Rev. Charles Lewis
Rev. Matthew Fong
Rev. Donald Stuart
Rev. Lloyd Wake

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Lia Belli
Democratic Candidate,
State Senate

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON "J"
STATEMENT BY UNION OFFICIALS

The United Nations General Assembly declared South African apartheid “a crime against humanity”; and that investment in South Africa "encourages the apartheid policies of that country".

Representatives of several hundred million unionists, meeting under UN -ILO auspices, called for the elimination of stocks of companies investing in South Africa, from pension funds.

As unionists and human rights advocates we support this measure.

Committee for International Support of Trade Union Rights
Charles Lamb
Anthony L. Ramos
Jack Goldberger
Curtis Mc Clain
Frank Souza
Stanley M. Smith
Mary Anne Petersen
Timothy J. Twomey
Walter L. Johnson
Jack Henning
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

To protect American interests and to halt the spread of Communist influence into South Africa, responsible action is needed to end legally-required racial segregation and to reasonably extend voting rights.

Proposition J is an important step towards a moderate solution of the South African problem.

Mike Garza
Republican State Committeeman

Max Woods
Republican Assembly Nominee
Todd Roust
Republican State Senate Nominee
Terence Faulkner
Republican County Committeeman
Robert Silvestri
Republican Assembly Nominee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

WARNING TO VOTERS
Disregard any self-serving statements by Peter Ashe, Meta Stanley, and their controversial Retirement Board in connection with Proposition J.

The Retirement Board has done more than just aid South Africa by its investment policies.

The Retirement Board has made serious investment errors, produced poor investment yields, and run up market value investment portfolio losses of $160,852,320 (as of 3/30/84) with Prudential-Bache.

Mike Garza
Robert Silvestri
Max Woods

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Rainbow Coalition and all members, support this initiative. Stop investments of San Francisco pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa.

Support Human Rights. People have a right to know that their pension funds are being used to support a racist, repressive, apartheid system, that denies basic human and civil rights to 24 million Africans. We have a right to know that a Black man can be detained in the South African penal system for as long as two years, for not having identification. That Black people are denied the right to vote, buy or sell land, and the right to live or work where they choose. Support Human Rights. Vote in favor of prop. J.

Gale White
African American of the Rainbow
Rev. Howard Gloyd
Northern California Chairman
The Rainbow Coalition

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

San Francisco CSPEES supports the removal of city pension fund investments from firms that profit from apartheid.

The government of South Africa, like the government of El Salvador, denies its people the most basic human rights: freedom from arbitrary arrest and torture; freedom of speech and association; and the right to a decent standard of living.

In 1983, San Franciscans said no to military aid to El Salvador. In 1984, let us say no to investments in South Africa.

San Francisco Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador
South African Investment Policy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Apartheid continues to be used to enslave black working people in South Africa. International labor has consistently condemned apartheid, and agrees that divestment from South Africa is an effective means of pressure.

David Aroner, Executive Director
SEIU Local 535
Timothy Twomey, Secretary-Treasurer
Hospital and Institutional Workers
Local 250
Paul Varacalli, Executive Director
United Public Employees Local 390/400
SEIU

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

For the Black majority, apartheid in South Africa means no right to vote, unionize or speak out. Those who resist are murdered, tortured and imprisoned. Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress, has been imprisoned for over twenty years. Apartheid is fascism!

U.S. companies investing in South Africa profit from low wages paid to Black workers, and play a key role in keeping apartheid alive. Say NO to apartheid and racism—Vote YES on Prop J.

Henry Clark, Candidate for Congress, Fifth Congressional District
Gloria La Riva
All-Peoples' Congress
Johnnie Stevens
Southern Africa Freedom Committee

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

The Joint Council of the Service Employees International Union has unanimously endorsed this proposal. The Union took this action because of the economic oppression of citizens by the South African Government, because of the termination of trade union rights and the arrest of union leaders, and because of the moral "Crime against humanity" of Apartheid.

Timothy J. Twomey

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

South African apartheid is condemned the world over. Even the Reagan Administration expresses opposition.

Yet South Africa and apartheid continue to flourish, subjecting all non-whites to the vilest humiliations, discrimination, and exploitation.

San Francisco supports apartheid through our investment of municipal pension funds in companies that do business in South Africa. By their very presence there, these companies maintain the status quo. Otherwise, the ruling white minority would not welcome these investments! We allow apartheid to continue, despite all the rhetoric we direct at South Africa.

San Franciscans can make responsible investments elsewhere. Voting YES on J, we join other cities in cutting the taproot—foreign finance—which allows the horrors of South Africa to go on, and on, and on... End it! Vote YES, against apartheid!

Executive Committee
Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY A PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.312 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF $104,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, FINANCING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING WATER DEPARTMENT FACILITIES; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 6, 1984.

WHEREAS, Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the Board of Supervisors in each instance, the Public Utilities Commission shall have authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving or developing water facilities of the San Francisco Water Department subject to the revenue bond voter approval requirements of Charter Section 7.300, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco by resolution No. 84-0363 adopted July 24, 1984, pursuant to said Section 7.312, has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held for that purpose on November 6, 1984, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it read on June 5, 1984, and Charter Section 7.312 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission, in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Public Utilities Commission in said resolution 84-0363.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 6, 1984, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, all as set forth in the following proposition:

Public Utilities Commission Revenue Bonds

Shall the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 pursuant to Charter Section 7.312 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing additions, betterments and improvements to the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system, including filtration and treatment works and plants, reservoirs and other water supply, storage and distribution facilities, lands and equipment necessary or convenient for the San Francisco Water Department water supply, storage and distribution system?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of $104,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is herein defined to be the City and County of San Francisco municipal water supply, storage and distribution systems of the San Francisco Water Department, including all of the presently existing municipal water system of the City and County and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing water system and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single, unified, integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the bonds. It is hereby found and determined that said municipal water system is necessary to enable the City and County to exercise its municipal powers and functions, namely, to furnish sufficient water for any present or future beneficial use of the City and County.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, financing, improving and developing San Francisco Water Department facilities, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith.

(b) The estimated costs of the acquisition, construction, financing, improvement and development is $104,000,000. Said estimated cost includes all costs and expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agents' fees, cost of the revenue bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds, and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed 12 months after completion of construction.

(c) The maximum principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is $104,000,000.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereafter prescribed for use at said election.

(b) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereon canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided, and in all particulars not described by the resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 32 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(b) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to be held in the City and County on November 6, 1984, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established.
and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published on or about October 15, 1984 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated thereunder, shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution.

(e) Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special revenue bond election, each voter to vote for said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "YES" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "NO" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

$104,000,000 San Francisco Water Department Revenue Bonds.

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in Section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.312 of the Charter of the City and County. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Public Utilities Commission and shall be secured by a pledge and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only an indebtedness of the Public Utilities Commission payable solely out of revenues received by the Public Utilities Commission from San Francisco Water Department facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

Section 5. This resolution shall be printed in the voters' pamphlet and mailed to each registered voter pursuant to Section 9.105 of the Charter of the City and County.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C, Continued from page 61

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, 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 or 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 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, plats 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.

The department of public works shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to the laws relating thereto, as follows:

(a) to cooperate with and assist the police department in the promotion of
traffic safety education;
(b) to receive, study and give prompt attention to complaints relating to street design or traffic devices or the absence thereof;
(c) to collect, compile, analyze and interpret traffic and parking data and to analyze and interpret traffic accident information;
(d) to engage in traffic research and traffic planning; and
(e) to cooperate for the best performance of these functions with any department and agency of the city and county and the state as may be necessary.

The department shall submit to the traffic bureau of the police department, for its review and recommendation, all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices; provided, however, that the bureau may waive submission and review of plans of particular devices designated by it. Failure of the said traffic bureau to submit to the department its recommendation on any proposed plan within fifteen (15) days after receipt shall be considered an automatic approval of said traffic bureau. The department shall not, with respect to any traffic control devices, implement such plan until the recommendation of the traffic bureau has been reviewed or until the fifteen (15) day period has elapsed.

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 upon 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.

Department of Public Health, which shall be administered by a director of public health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than ten years' practice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician or surgeon requirement may be waived by the board of supervisors. He shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not limited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Kaiser Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assistant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of public health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital who shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one dentist, all regularly certificated. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years, provided, however, that those first appointed shall vest their interests in the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1933, 1934 and 1935, respectively, and the term of one member in 1926.

Such board shall consider and report on all problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

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 Measure, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of scaler 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 June 5, 1989, November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending section 3.610 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.

PART TWENTY-ONE: HEALTH COMMISSION

3.695 Composition of Department; Commission

The public health department shall consist of a health commission, a director of public health and such employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter. The department shall be under the management of a health commission consisting of seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor. Said commission shall have less than a majority of direct providers of health care. Direct providers of health care shall mean all
health professionals and others whose "primary current activity" is the provision of patient care or the administration of facilities or institutions which provide patient care. The term of each member of the commission shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1985; provided, that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years, and one for one year. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each of said members shall be filled by the mayor. No commissioner may serve more than two consecutive terms or a total of eight years.

The compensation of each commissioner shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month. The commissioners shall annually elect one of their members president. They shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the governance of the commission.

3.696 Director of Public Health; Other Executives

The health commission shall appoint a director of public health who shall serve at the pleasure of the commission and shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. The director of public health shall be a regularly licensed physician in the State of California, with not less than five years' experience in public health administration immediately preceding his or her appointment thereto; provided, however, that the physician requirement may be waived by the health commission. The director of public health shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, manage all operations under its jurisdiction. The director shall have power to appoint and remove a deputy director for operations, a deputy director for community health programs, an administrator for San Francisco General Hospital and an administrator for Laguna Honda Hospital. The administrators of San Francisco General Hospital and of Laguna Honda Hospital shall have power to appoint and remove associate administrators to the extent such positions are created by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

These positions shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter and shall be held by persons who possess the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the divisions and institutions of the department. However, any person who has civil service status in any of the above positions on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to have such status under the civil service provisions of this charter. All positions in the department legally authorized shall be continued and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.697 Powers and Duties

The health commission shall manage and control the city and county hospitals, emergency medical services, and all matters pertaining to the preservation, promotion, and protection of the lives, health and mental health of the inhabitants of the city and county, except where this charter specifically grants that power to another department. It may also determine the nature and character of public health nuisances and provide for their abatement.

The commission shall inspect the sanitary conditions of the municipal institutions of the city and county, including jails and all public buildings; of the disposition of the dead; of the disposition of garbage, offensive and offensive substances.

The commission shall be a policy-making and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in section 3.500 of this charter. The commission shall have the power to establish and make appointments to advisory committees as it shall deem necessary.

8.107 Suspension and Removal

Any elective officer, and any member of the civil service commission, health commission, or public utilities commission or school board may be suspended by the mayor and removed by the board of supervisors for official misconduct, and the mayor shall appoint a qualified person to discharge the duties of the office during the period of suspension. On such suspension, the mayor shall immediately notify the supervisors thereof in writing and the cause therefor, and shall present written charges against such suspended officer to the board of supervisors at or prior to its next regular meeting following such suspension, and shall immediately furnish copy of same to such officer, who shall have the right to appear with counsel before the board in his defense. Hearing by the supervisors shall be held not less than five days after the filing of written charges. If the charges are deemed to be sustained by not less than a three-fourths vote of all members of the board, the suspended officer shall be removed from office; if not so sustained, or if not acted on by the board of supervisors within thirty (30) days after the filing of written charges, the suspended officer shall thereby be reinstated.

The mayor must immediately remove from office any elective official convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, and failure of the mayor so to act shall constitute official misconduct on his or her part.

Any appointee of the mayor, exclusive of civil service, health, recreation and park, and public utilities commissioners, and members of the school board, may be removed by the mayor. Any nominee or appointee of the mayor whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors, except the chief administrative officer and the controller, as in this charter otherwise provided, may be removed by a majority of such board and with the concurrence of the mayor. In each case, written notice shall be given or transmitted to such appointee of such removal, the date of effectiveness thereof, and the reasons therefor, a copy of which notice shall be printed at length in the journal of proceedings of the board of supervisors, together with such reply in writing as such official may make. Any appointee of the mayor or the board of supervisors guilty of official misconduct or convicted of crime involving moral turpitude must be removed by the mayor or the board of supervisors, as the case may be, and failure of the mayor or any supervisor to take such action shall constitute official misconduct on his or their part.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F — Continued from page 69

“Retirement allowance,” or “allowance,” shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

“Compensation,” as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

“Compensation earned” shall mean the compensation as determined by the re-
the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection P (f) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection B (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection B (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said subsection P (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection G (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection G (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member’s retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection G (e) of this section, may elect to receive the actual equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits, provided, however, that at any time within thirty 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of sixty-five 65 years may elect, without right to revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be in writing and on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county’s contributions shall be not less than one hundred (100) dollars per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years of more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county’s contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than one hundred (100) dollars per month, in the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for
each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

E (c) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in subsection E (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection A (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowance shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensationearable by the member in the class of service rendered by him during the one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commissioner or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

D (d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

E (e) If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection E (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his or her member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him or her member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his or her member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection E (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the date of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

n (A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

h (B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this subsection E (e), and for on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this subsection E (e), any allowance payable under this subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members;

P (I) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and unemployment with and without receipt of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system,
provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety (90) days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, ninety (90) days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus one and two-thirds (1 2/3) percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

\( G \) (g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous office or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to him had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and services rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore shall be required of the city and county.

\( H \) (ii) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.507 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7 1/2) percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in sections 8.509(c) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection \( G \) (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual ac-

counts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection \( H \) (ii), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), subsection \( H \) (ii), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits hereunder to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, than held by said system to provide said benefits, on account of service rendered by respective members after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries therefor payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probability of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be
made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision 5 (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of thirty 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provision of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

4 (i) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection B (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said subsection B (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

5 (j) No person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as a election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

6 (k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

7 (l) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections B (a), c (c), F (f) and (f) (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection B (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within ninety 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, no shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.584-5 Death Benefit
If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:
(a) If no benefit is payable under Section B (b) of this section:
(1) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to his the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of twelve months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(b) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Section 8.584-2, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subsection (b), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subsection (a) of this section, the amount of said benefit payable under Subsection (a) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subsection (b) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(1) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(2) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subsection (a) of this section in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this section, for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so
made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this section, any allowance payable under this §subsection (b) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

Upon the death of a member after retirement, an allowance, in addition to the death benefit provided in the immediately preceding paragraph, shall be paid to his surviving spouse, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, equal to one-half of his retirement allowance as it was prior to optional modification and prior to reduction as provided in §subsection (a) of §section 5.514 of this charter, but exclusive of the part of such allowance which was provided by additional contributions. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this paragraph to a surviving spouse unless such surviving spouse was married to said member at least one year prior to his retirement. If such retired person leaves no such surviving spouse, or if such surviving spouse should die or remarry before every child of such deceased retired person attains the age of 18 eighteen years, the allowance which such surviving spouse would have received had he or she lived and not remarried shall be paid to retired person's children or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 eighteen years.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.340 Dismissal During Probation Period

Any person appointed to a permanent position shall serve a probationary period. The civil service commission shall by rule establish a probationary period of not less than six months' service and up to a maximum of twelve months' service for each classification, provided that the probationary period for entrance positions in the uniformed rank of the police department fire department, sheriff's department and San Francisco International Airport & police force shall be for one year, twelve months except that, with respect to members of the uniformed ranks of the police department, the probationary period shall be completed after twelve months' service from the date following completion of the prescribed department field training officer program, but in no case to exceed eighty-four weeks from the date of appointment; provided further that probationary members of the uniformed ranks of the police department charged with breach of duty or misconduct shall be afforded the procedural rights set forth in section 8.343 for such charges. Probationary periods of twelve months and up to a maximum of twenty-four months may be established for executive and management classifications. At any time during the probationary period the appointing officer may terminate the appointment upon giving written notice of such termination to the employee and to the civil service commission specifying the reasons for such termination. Except in the case of members of the uniformed ranks of the police and fire department the civil service commission shall review the termination. The civil service commission shall by rule establish the procedures for such review. If the appointment resulted from an entrance examination the commission may declare such person dismissed or may return the name to the list of eligibles under such conditions for further appointment as the commission may deem just. If the appointment resulted from a promotional examination the employee shall have the right of appeal and hearing before the civil service commission. The commission shall render a decision within thirty days after receipt of the notice of termination and (a) may declare such person dismissed; or (b) order such person reinstated in his to the position without prejudice, and the commission may in its discretion order that the employee be paid salary from time of the termination of his the appointment; or (c) order the return of such person to a position in the classification from which he that person was promoted and may reestablish the employee's eligibility to a list of eligibles for the same promotive classification under such conditions as the commission may deem just. The decision of the commission shall be final. Immediately prior to the expiration of the probationary period the appointing officer shall report to the civil service commission as to the competence of the probationer for the position, and if competent, shall recommend permanent appointment. Nothing in this section shall preclude the civil service commission from reviewing terminations for the purpose of future employability including terminations in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.405 Salaries of Uniformed Forces in the Police and Fire Departments.

(a) Not later than the 1st day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid to police officers or patrolmen patrol officers employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission's survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each police officer or patrolman patrol officer classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as police officers or patrolmen patrol officers in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its
duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 3.531 of this Charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers the compensation shall be fixed at a rate which is the average maximum wage paid to the police officers or patrolmen patrol officer classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of police officer classifications in cities in said certification;

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

The expression “rates of compensation”, as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differential of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in Section 166 of the charter of 1932, as amended, and, with the addition of fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month now provided in Subsection (b) with respect to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean “compensation earnable” as used in Section 8.549.

The term “police officers or patrolmen patrol officers” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

In determining years of service necessary for a police officer, woman protective officer and police patrol driver to receive the annual compensation as provided for herein, service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be given full credit and allowed.

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by Section 8.361 of this Charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

On the recommendation of the chief of police, the commission may reward any member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct. The form or amount of said reward is to be discretionary with the commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

If any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he such member shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(b) Not later than the first day of August of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, additional rates of pay paid to members assigned to all two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the additional rates for two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty shall include the average additional amount paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities surveyed.

Thereupon the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. The additional rate of pay will be determined by the average additional wage paid to members in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the additional rates of pay certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of cities in said certification. Said additional rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

Said rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in Subsection (a).

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per month.

(c) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen firefighters employed in the respective fire departments of all cities of 350,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census. For the purpose of the civil service commission’s survey and certification the rates contained in said certification shall be the average of the maximum rates paid to each fireman firefighter classification performing the same or essentially the same duties as firemen firefighters in the City and County of San Francisco.

Thereupon, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in section 3.542 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective from the first day of July of the current fiscal year.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(1) for the fourth year of service and thereafter the rate of compensation shall
be fixed at a rate which is the average of the maximum compensation paid firemen firefighter classifications in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission. “Average wage” as used in this paragraph shall mean the sum of the maximum averages certified by the civil service commission divided by the number of firemen firefighter classifications in cities in said certification.

(2) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen firefighters shall be established in accordance with the general percentage differential between seniority steps found in the salary ranges included in the cities certified by the civil service commission for the same class;

(3) for said members of the fire department other than firemen firefighters shall include the same percent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen firefighters in the fourth year of service; and

(4) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences for any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation”, as used in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 of the charter of 1932, as amended and “compensation carnable” as used in section 8,549.

The term “firemen” “firefighters” as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 350,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective rate of this section by drivers, stokers, tillermen, truckmen, or hosemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department. The expression “members of the fire department” does not include members of the fire commission.

The absence of any officer or member of the fire department on military leave of absence, as defined by section 8,361 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his such member’s service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided in this charter.

On the recommendation of the chief of department, the commission may reward any officer or member of the department for heroic or meritorious conduct, the form or amount of said award to be discretionary with the fire commission, but not to exceed one month’s salary in any one instance.

The rates of compensation for the ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall be thirteen percent (13%) above the compensation established for the ranks of captain and lieutenant as provided for in this section. The rates of compensation for the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall be ten percent (10%) above the compensation established for the rank of chief’s operator as provided for in this section. The rate of compensation shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this subsection, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

(d) The rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) (1), (2) and (3) and the rates of compensation fixed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c) (1), (2) and (3) shall be the same. Such rates shall not exceed the highest average rate of compensation fixed pursuant to subsections (a) (1), (2) and (3) and (c) (1), (2) and (3) above, whether it be paid to police officers, patrol officers, officers or firemen; firefighters; provided, further, that the minimum rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant in the police department shall be equal to the rate of compensation attached to the rank of lieutenant in the fire department.

(e) Not later than the 25th day of August the board of supervisors shall have the power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions of paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for uniformed members of the police and fire departments for the then current fiscal year.

(f) Not later than the first day of August of each year, the civil service commission shall determine and certify to the board of supervisors the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the twelve-month period ending March 31st of that same year as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items San Francisco, and the percentage of increase or decrease in the cost of living during the same period as shown by the Consumer Price Index, All Items, in the cities included in the certified report of said commission. The Consumer Price Index referred to herein is defined as that certain index issued by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and published in the Monthly Labor Review or a successor publication. In the event the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics discontinues the compilation and publication of said indexes, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to appoint a statistical fact finding committee to determine the same data pursuant to the methods heretofore used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living adjustments as hereafter provided shall be based upon the percentage of such increases or decreases. The board of supervisors may, in addition to the rates of compensation as established herein, and at the same time said rates of compensation are established, increase said rates of compensation by an amount equal to the difference between the average cost of living increase of the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission and the actual cost of living increase for San Francisco. In the event the board of supervisors elects not to grant such cost of living increase in any year in which any such increase might be granted, the board of supervisors shall, upon a written request filed with the clerk of the board of supervisors not later than the 10th day of September of said year by representatives of the uniformed members of the police and fire departments, as designated by the police and fire commissions, respectively, submit the question of said cost of living increase to the qualified electors of the city and county at the next succeeding city-wide election. In the event said cost of living increase is approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon, said cost of living increase shall be effective as of the first day of the then current fiscal year.

(g) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uni-
formed member of the police or fire department employed before July 1, 1976, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of any new compensation schedules, and the rates for fiscal year 1975-76 shall continue until such time as the new schedules equal or exceed the current salary increment schedules, provided, however, that such time shall not be extended beyond June 30, 1982, and provided further that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

(h) Notwithstanding any of the provisions contained in this section, no uniformed member of the police or fire department, whose compensation is fixed pursuant to the formula contained herein, shall suffer a salary reduction by the application of the compensation schedules provided for herein. Provided, however, that this prohibition against reduction of compensation for the designated employees shall not be deemed to supersede the provisions of section 8.406 of this charter.

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT VOTING

You can vote for any candidate, regardless of party. This is a General Election and you can vote for any candidate on your ballot. Political party restrictions only apply at Primary Elections (in June).

Do not vote for more than the authorized number of candidates or none of your votes for that contest will be counted. Most candidate contests specify "Vote for one" but you can vote for up to six supervisors and up to four School and College Board members. If you make a mistake and vote for more than six candidates for supervisor you can get a replacement ballot.

If you move, you must re-register. The most common complaint we get on election day is that someone can't vote because they have moved and not re-registered. If you have moved, your name will probably not be on the rolls anymore and even if it is, it is not legal to vote using your old polling place (except in certain rare circumstances). Next time you move, don't leave your vote behind; remember to re-register.

You don't have to be sick or out-of-town to get an absentee ballot. Any voter can request an absentee ballot for any reason, or for no reason. To become a "permanent" absentee voter you must be disabled but ordinary absentee voters do not have to have a reason.

Your registration will not necessarily be cancelled if you don't vote but chances of that happening will increase if you don't vote. After the election, we will send a postcard confirming the address of all nonvoters. If the Post Office or the current resident says you don't live there anymore, your registration will be cancelled. No one is automatically cancelled for not voting at any election.

It is not necessary to re-register before each election. Your registration is permanent and will remain in effect until you move, die or are convicted of a felony.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

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."

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there still is a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:45 a.m. to about 8:30 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, November 6. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________

Address ____________________________ Apt. # ______

Telephone No. (required) ____________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

I want to work in the following area(s): ____________________________

Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________

Signature ____________________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE VOTER’S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN DE BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

I hereby apply for an absent voter’s ballot:

Por favor envié la balota por correo:

Please mail ballot to me at:
Mailing address, if different from above

Description of Handicap/Disability
Voter’s Initials

VOTANTE AUSENTE PERMANENTE
Por la presente solicito clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente. De conformidad con los requerimientos de la Sección 1451 del Código Electoral, presento la siguiente razón de mi solicitud para clasificación como Votante Ausente Permanente.

Descripción del Impedimente/Incapacidad
Iniciales del Votante

EXTRA APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Since this page would have been blank anyway, we have used the space to reprint an extra copy of the absentee ballot application form.

Your "real" absentee ballot application appears as a postcard inserted into this book. We would prefer that you use the postcard form because it is easier to process and less likely to get lost.

If two persons in your household are requesting absentee ballots, you may put both postcard forms into an envelope in order to save postage.

The disabled may apply as permanent absentee voters by completing the little box at the bottom of the form. Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairments as well as more severe disabilities.

If you have not yet received your absentee ballot, then you are probably not on our permanent absentee mailing list. The permanent absentee voters' ballots were mailed out the week of October 9th.
LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

MAILING ADDRESS

BALLOT TYPE
171

GENERAL ELECTION
6th Congressional District
3rd Senate District
17th Assembly District
(BART)

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
4200's, 4600's, 4700's

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 48
Aplicacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la Pagina 48
缺席選票申請表刊在第48頁

POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Election day workers are needed at the polls in most San Francisco Neighborhoods, Bilingual citizens are particularly encouraged to apply.

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:
The "yes" or "no" on the second line of your address label indicates whether or not your polling place is wheelchair accessible.
This evaluation takes into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter en route to the polls have not been considered.